DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 077 912 SP 006 612

TITLE	Urban Education Institute. Director's Report, 1970-71.
INSTITUTION	Pasadena City Coll., Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Higher Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Coll. Support.
PUB DATE	Jul 71
NOTE	85p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Colleges; Continuous Learning; Educational Disadvantagement; Inservice Programs; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Institutes (Training Programs); *Urban Education; *Urban Teaching

ABSTRACT

This is an interim report on the Urban Education Institute, which is designed to provide part-time in-service education for experienced community college personnel. The objectives of the program are listed as follows: to retrain and retool teams of experienced personnel in order to make these personnel more effective/affective in meeting the needs of students from educationally or sociologically deprived backgrounds and, in the process, to effect institutional change within each cooperating college to make that institution more responsive to the demands of urban education. Participants are designated as trainees, training instructors, and ghetto/barrio tutors. Included as appendixes are committee reports and assignment data. (JA)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 077912

URBAN EDUCATION INSTITUTE

Director's Report, 1970-71

I SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF REPORT

In a memorandum received April 28, 1971, each director of an EPDA/E funded project was asked to submit an Evaluation Report within thirty days of the conclusion of the project. This report attempts to fulfill that obligation. Point by point it follows the outline suggested in the April memorandum.

This is no sense of the word a final Evaluation Report on the Urban Education Institute. It is an interim report inasmuch as a second year's program, 1971-72, is being implemented at the present time. The proposal requesting funds for a third year of operation, 1972-73, will be submitted even before this interim report is completed.

Additional basic data requested in this section of the report follow:

Name and address of institution:

Pasadena City College
Pasadena Area Community College District
1570 East Colorado Boulevard
Pasadena, California 91106

Name of Institute: URBAN EDUCATION INSTITUTE, Project No. 70.2018

Director's Name & Title: Dr. Ruth Macfarlane, Urban Careers Specialist, Pasadena City College, Pasadena, California 91106 (213) 795-6961, ext. 431

Departments included in program planning and operation: Office of Instruction, Office of Occupational Education

Dates of project operation: July 1, 1970 - June 30, 1971

SP 006 612

II PROGRAM FOCUS

The 1970-71 Urban Education Institute provided part-time inservice education for 40 experienced community college personnel. Objectives remained as stated in the proposal submitted July 1969:

1 to retrain, retool teams of experienced personnel from the four community college members of the Southern California College Consortium, in order

2 to make these personnel more effective/affective in meeting the needs of students from educationally or sociologically deprived background; and in the process

3 to effect institutional change within each cooperating college to make that institution more responsive to the challenge of urban education.

In order of significance the major emphasis of training was, first, on development of attitudes, then on methods and skills, and, third, on knowledges.

For the processes used to achieve stated objectives, see copies of flyers used for recruitment purposes fall semester 1970 and spring semester 1971 (APPENDIX I). In summary these processes were as follows:

a) Trainees served as instructional assistants in selected training media.

b) Trainees were involved in community practicum jointly supervised by training instructors and ghetto/barrio tutors selected from students enrolled in training media.

c) Trainees were concurrently enrolled in a University postgraduate professional seminar serving a dual purpose: ongoing evaluation along with enhancement of community involvement skills.

III PROGRAM OPERATION

/ A Participants / There were three types of participants in the training program: trainees per se, training instructors, ghetto/barrio tutors.

Trainees were recruited from the four urban community college members of the Southern California College Consortium: Compton College, East Los Angeles College, Los Angeles City College, and Pasadena City College. Since the project funded a total of 40 trainees during the academic year, each college was assigned a team of five trainees per semester. Nine trainees enrolled for two semester; thirty-one trainees were enrolled but one semester. During the spring semester fifteen trainees were enrolled for the first time; some of them may re-enroll fall semester 1971. See Table 1 below.

Table 1 - Trainees, Urban Education Institute, 1970-71

College	Fall 1970	Spring 1971	Total 1970-71	No. of Individuals
Compton	4	6	10	6
East Los Angeles	3	7	10	9
Los Angeles City	5	5	10	8
Pasadena City	4	6	10	8
Total	16	24	40	31

Each of the four cooperating community colleges was responsible for recruiting and selecting its own team of trainees.

Trainees were assigned to designated training media. Ipso facto instructors responsible for these media became participants in the Institute as "training instructors." During the fall semester Pasadena City College provided the

training media for all sixteen trainees enrolled. During the spring semester the four cooperating community colleges provided training media for the twenty-four trainees enrolled. See Table 2 below; also see APPENDIX II for fall and spring semester rosters of trainees by college.

Table 2 - Scope of Training, Urban Education Institute 1970-71

College	Training Media	Training Instructors	No. of Trainees
Fall Semester			
Pasadena City	10	9	16
Spring Semester			
Compton	2	2	6
East Los Angeles	1	2	3
Los Angeles City	3	3	5
Pasadena City	5	5	10
Sub-Total	13	12	24

Ghetto/barrio tutors constituted a third component of participants. They were students enrolled in the training media. They were selected by trainees themselves assisted at times by training instructors. It took a little time the first semester to implement this component of the training program, but by the end of that semester 13 tutors were actively involved in the Institute; twenty-five participated during spring semester.

The selection criteria stipulated in the April memorandum circumscribing this Evaluation Report do not apply adequately to either one of the three groups of participants. "Geographic limitation" applied to the extent that trainee applicants were limited to personnel of four cooperating community colleges.

To repeat, recruitment of trainees was the responsibility of each community college. Interviews were no doubt used, and the current position of the trainee was probably important in making final selections where the number of applications exceeded openings. Other criteria were irrelevant.

In addition to the three groups of participants already described, there were peripheral participants. Everyone involved in any way with the Institute experienced a certain amount of retraining: community college presidents and UCLA vice-chancellors as members of the Southern California College Consortium; U.E.I. administrators on each community college campus; the seminar's leader and consultant on evaluation; other UCLA Extension staff; the two graduate students sent out by the Center for Education Policy Research, Harvard University, in fulfillment of its contract with the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development; and last, but not least, the director of the Institute.

On no one of the four campuses was the ratio of participants to full faculty staff impressively, even perceptibly high. Pasadena City College's faculty alone totals over three hundred; only eight were enrolled as trainees; nine others participated as training instructors, four passively, five actively. Trainees/participants had to make up in missionary zeal what they lacked in numbers.

While there were three, even four distinct groups of participants in the Urban Education Institute, 1970-71, the focus of its major objective was on the teams of trainees selected by each of the four cooperating community colleges. The raison d'etre for the Institute was to train 40 experienced community college personnel. As noted in Table 1, thirty-one individuals were trained. Since nine of them went through two semesters of training, all 40

authorized slots were filled during the course of the year.

The thirty-one individuals trained may be categorized as follows:

Administrators (dean or assistant dean)	2
Counselors	2
Campus minister	1
Teaching faculty	26
Anthropology	1
Art	1
Business	5
Computer Sciences	1
Cosmetology	1
Economics	1
Education	1
Engineering & Technology	2
English	4
History	1
Home Economics	1
Mathematics	1
Nursing	1
Psychology	1
Sociology	2
Special Services for Disadvantaged	2

/ B Staff / A full listing of the Urban Education Institute staff for 1970-71 is given in APPENDIX III, showing administrative staff and three categories of instructional staff, 1) instructors of selected training media, 2) UCLA seminar leaders, and 3) ghetto/barrio tutors.

Even the most cursory overview of this listing will answer many questions alluded to in the April memorandum, e.g., relative influence of different types of staff, regular and visiting faculty, identification of inter-disciplinary and/or cooperative arrangements, existence of joint supervision of the training program, joint research, use of team teaching, etc. Many of these points will be elaborated on in succeeding sections of this report under Activities, Evaluation and Conclusions. Only a few additional comments are in order here.

As noted in APPENDIX III, all training instructors, including UCLA seminar leaders and the ghetto/barrio tutors, were part-time.

"Cooperative arrangements" is perhaps the key phrase in the April memorandum. That concept turned out to be the name of the game for the Urban Education Institute. To start with, the Institute was designed around a consortium, calling for cooperative arrangements on the part of the University of California Los Angeles and four urban community collgges. Operations made these cooperative arrangements a reality. Teaching faculty at the four community colleges "cooperated" by serving as training instructors, their classes or special services activities providing the training media. Community agencies cooperated as employers of the ghetto/barrio tutors responsible for the trainees' community practicums. Trainees were jointly supervised by training instructors and ghetto/barrio tutors. All three participating components (See Section II, FOCUS) were involved in joint research. Advisory committee deliberations were a continuous exercise in joint responsibility.

/ C Activities / The specified objectives (see Section II, PROGRAM FOCUS) were met as indicated below:

Objective #1: Eight teams of experienced community college personnel, two teams each for the four cooperating community colleges, or a sum total of forty trainees, were duly "retrained" in accordance with the proposal and the grant award.

Objective #2: Are the "retrained" personnel more affective/effective in meeting the needs of low-income and minority students? That is still the question. The remaining sections of this Report, particularly Section D, Evaluation, will attempt to assess the extent to which the Institute has achieved, and is achieving this highly elusive but reality-based objective. This is what the Institute, and EPDA/E, is all about.

Objective #3: A certain amount of institutional change was effected. It was built in. Dr. Seligman, consultant on evaluation, commented more than once that the Institute was the most intricate arrangement of overlapping and interwoven relationships that he ever hoped to cope with. The complexity was deliberate. It was intended that the Institute should bore from within, and it has, with ever-widening ramifications. Staffing patterns (See APPENDIX III) are evidence of the many intertwining facets of the Institute. Willy nilly some institutional change was bound to occur.

Following are some of the Urban Education Institute's unique features to illustrate the attempt to innovate in the area of inservice education for experienced personnel in order to meet EPDA/E's as well as cooperating community colleges' high priority needs engendered by the urban crisis:

a) Instead of exposing trainees to 45 hours of being talked at even by highly qualified experts, or to 45 hours of solving simulated problems, the

Urban Education Institute immersed trainees in several times that number of hours of close interpersonal relationships with older and younger adults who have experienced much different life styles, i.e., low-income and minority.

b) The Institute put the burden of retraining on the community colleges most immediately involved rather than on a University removed and aloof in more ways than one from the grinding problems of the innercity.

c) The Institute decentralized the University component of the training process. The University instructor was required to leave her campus. She joined the trainees, assisting them at their training sites to become more effective instructional assistants in selected training media. She also held team meetings on each community college campus. By spring semester the seminar was a team teaching effort, involving ghetto/barrio tutors as well as training instructors.

d) The advisory committee is a very important administrative adjunct. In effect it is a sub-committee of the Southern California College Consortium. It assists in the formulation of policy and ongoing evaluation, also in the implementation of the Institute on four campuses as well as of the UCLA seminar. Eight meetings have been held since April 1970, when notification of award was received. Copies of minutes are attached as APPENDIX IV.

e) Perhaps the Urban Education Institute's chief innovation lies in the conundrum of who is teaching whom. The Institute is designed around the postulate that the professional has much to learn from the nonprofessional, that is, from the New Careerist. The nonprofessional becomes the teacher. The reverse role is humbling, and chastening. If the trainee will only open his mind and heart to this new experience he will find it eminently rewarding. This too is what the Urban Education Institute is all about.

The director is asked to comment about each segment of the program. To repeat, the Institute provides three closely interrelated training activities: 1) involvement of trainee in a training medium as an "instructional assistant;" 2) community practicum under the guidance/supervision of a ghetto/barrio tutor identified with the training medium as a New Student; and 3) co-enrollment in the UCLA seminar in community involvement skills. Since the three activities are interdependent it is difficult to assess the relative effectiveness of any-one component. Each component stands to be improved; there is no question about that. With improvement of anyone of them the effectiveness of the other two will be enhanced.

By its very nature the Institute is always changing; it is viable process. Here are a few of the changes being made in the 1971-72 program as the result of a continual evaluative process during its first year of operation:

a) Ethnic classes will be dropped as training media in favor or urban careers classes or other media which enroll higher proportions of nonprofes-sionals/New Careerists who, experience has shown, make the most effective tutors.

b) Other training media, e.g., Student Resources Centers and other EOP on-campus and community based tutorial, counseling services, will be more thoroughly field-tested, having been sampled spring semester 1971.

c) Confrontation as a training technique will be de-emphasized. Expe-rience has shown that confrontation for the sake of confrontation, whether in the training media or in the community practicum, soon reaches the point of diminishing returns. In the case of at least three trainees, confrontation proved to be self-defeating. It turned them off.

d) Ghetto/barrio tutors will be more carefully selected, and will be

more equitably reimbursed for over and beyond regular agency duties. Community practicum with tutors will be more closely coordinated/supervised.

e) Training media instructors will be more effectively oriented to the Institute's goals and objectives since they are kingpins in the training process. Serving as an instructional assistant provides the trainee with the much needed opportunity to try out his new sensitivities while continuing to enhance them through prolonged interaction with New Careerists.

f) The University seminar component will be more action oriented, with greater emphasis upon the community practicum.

g) Community college teams will be more carefully selected in terms of training commitment and in terms of institutional willingness to integrate Institute training into overall ongoing or envisioned inservice education.

- - - - - - - - - - -

Foregoing data cover request for information on "new techniques, materials or equipment used and their effectiveness," also on "effectiveness of distribution of staff and participant time for formal instruction or unstructured activities."

As to effectiveness of beginning and ending dates and duration of the program, it is submitted that a semester long, even a year long part-time institute can be more effective than a full-time short institute of one to four or even six weeks. The Urban Education Institute provides true inservice education, which, to be effective, should be ongoing with and thus complementary to the trainee's regular assignment. A part-time institute provides opportunities for feeding back into the trainee's assignment, and into his college's administrative and curricular structure.

The April memo's fourth request under Activities remains to be answered: extent to which there was participant involvement in decisions concerning the operation of the training program. The major vehicle for trainee involvement was through the seminar. The first session was an exercise in euphoria. The second session, the one Dr. Paul Carnell attended in November 1970, seemed at the time to be an exercise in futility. Trainee rebellion was a blessing in disguise, however. Things really began to happen. The seminar was decentralized, as had been the original intent; it began to function on community college campuses. In the meantime trainees were participating in advisory committee deliberations. Special reference is made to minutes of meeting held December 1, 1970 (APPENDIX IV). That particular meeting identified many trainee concerns.

Training instructors are being more and more involved in staff decisions, also in advisory committee meetings. It was wishful thinking to assume that they knew what they should be doing.

As far as ghetto/barrio tutors were concerned, it took a semester to convince trainees, training instructors and seminar staff that tutors were an integral part of the training process encompassed by the Institute. (The professional does feel threatened by the nonprofessional; there is no doubt about it.) In February 1971 the seminar leader held a closed session with ghetto/barrio tutors, who were highly articulate. From that point on tutors were very much involved in seminar sessions. Their inclusion, however, raised another problem. The increased size of the seminar sessions made for unwieldiness. During 1971-72 tutors will participate only in campus team meetings. They are more effective at that level anyway, according to the assistant director's evaluation.

/ D Evaluation / The April memorandum calls for four types of data in this section on Evaluation. They are treated seriatum.

1) Results of Objective Evaluation. At the end of the fall semester trainees were asked first to evaluate the program, and, second, to evaluate the tutor and the community practicum. The training instructor was also asked to evaluate the trainee. The ensuing data, combined with seminar discussions and advisory committee deliberations, helped the staff to restructure the Institute for spring semester.

During the spring semester formative evaluation continued through heightened and more clearly focused seminar activities, also through advisory committee deliberations sharpened by the inclusion of ghetto/barrio tutors.

The UCLA seminar also provided the services of a consultant on evaluation: Dr. Richard Seligman, acting director of the Center for the Study of Evaluation, Graduate School of Education, UCLA. Dr. Seligman involved himself in all seminar activities. In May he assisted U.E.I. staff in the design of more comprehensive instruments of evaluation. The questionnaires, which were filled out by participants at the last seminar session on June 5, 1971, provide reactions of training instructors, of trainees, and of tutors. Rap sheets solicited anonymous comments. Dr. Seligman's office coded the returns. See APPENDIX V for copies of the three instruments with tabulated results for those items adaptable to such codification.

Excerpts from minutes of the advisory committee meeting held July 13 (APPENDIX IV), reveal tentative conclusions:

> Dr. Seligman found most of the completed questionnaires exceedingly positive, much more so that he had expected. He was not entirely satisfied with the format nor the structure of the questionnaire, however; at best it was a pedestrian effort.
>
> Much discussion followed on how best to measure attitudinal and

behavioral changes experienced by trainees. Several instruments are available to measure attitudinal changes. The problem, not unique to the Urban Education Institute, lies with measurement of significant changes in behavior. It was suggested that student reactions to changing trainee behavior, if any, in trainees' ongoing classes might be measured. Another suggestion was to allow tutors to visit these classes and determine their trainees' changing behavior.

Supplies of OE Form 1216, "Participant Evaluation," arrived too late in the academic year to encompass first semester trainees. Twenty-four second semester trainees were given the form; twenty-three have been returned. They are incorporated in this report as APPENDIX VI. Copies have been made for use of U.E.I. staff.

2) Types, Frequency of Tests, etc. No "before and after" attitudinal tests were given. The possibility was discussed in planning sessions held in August 1970 with the seminar leaders, including the consultant on evaluation. It was decided even at that time that such tests would not reveal what needed to be known: extent of behavioral change. The difficulty of measuring such change has already been discussed. (See #1, above.)

In answer to request for information about types and frequency of questionnaires, see Item #1 above; also refer to APPENDIX V.

As already indicated, seminar sessions and advisory committee meetings provide open forums for airing concerns of trainees, training instructors, ghetto/barrio tutors, and bewildered U.E.I. administrators as well. In effect they provide what Dr. Seligman defines as "formative evaluation," in other words self-correcting evaluative processes. Previous sections of this report indicate the extent to which reoriented staff have incorporated suggested changes in planned implementation of the 1971-72 program.

A dividend evaluative conference took place during March 1971 with the arrival of two field representatives from Harvard University's Center for

Education Policy Research under its contract with the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development to evaluate selected EPDA/E projects. Dr. Seligman conferred at length with them: Harvard vs. UCLA. In addition Harvard took advantage of the proffered invitation to attend the seminar session on March 6. That was the first session to include ghetto/barrio tutors. It was an enlightening experience, a happening.

3) Long-term Evaluation. Inasmuch as the Urban Education Institute is funded for a second year there is built into its operations longer term evaluative processes than might otherwise be the case. Every effort by U.E.I. staff will be made to incorporate studies of behavior change of trainees into ongoing faculty evaluations at each of the four community colleges. This is all part of institutionalizing the changes that emerge from participation in the Institute. The third year proposal, i.e., for 1972-73, provides for a consultant whose primary responsibility will be the preparation of a cumulative three-year Evaluation Report come July 1973.

4) EPDA/E Guidelines: Problems. The major problem arises out of EPDA/E's over-emphasis upon full-time as against part-time institutes. As pointed out before, inservice education should be an ongoing process during the academic year, calling for part-time training. Released time for full-time institutes during the academic year is extremely difficult and very expensive for community colleges.

IV CONCLUSIONS

a) Impact. See Section III B, Staff, for Consortium involvement by cooperating institution. Also see Section III C, Activities, for evident institutional changes. Insofar as the host institution is concerned, i.e., Pasadena City College, it can be reported that the Urban Education Institute is being increasingly channeled into the administrative mainstream. For example, the Administrative Dean for Instruction, Dr. Stanley E. Gunstream, is assuming more and more responsibility for the Institute not only on the PCC campus but for overall operations as well. He is designated in the 1972-73 proposal as coordinator of the Institute.

Letters of commitment from cooperating colleges in the Consortium, attached to the 1972-73 proposal, indicate the "impact" of the Institute on these institutions.

b) Major Weaknesses. See Section III B, Activities, for changes being made in 1971-72 operations. These changes acknowledge admitted weaknesses in 1970-71 program. Briefly stated, there were weaknesses in every facet of the program: training media, community practicum, UCLA seminar, also in trainee as well as institutional commitment. Everyone learned a lot during the Institute's first year. Weaknesses in the Institute reflected underlying institutional weaknesses in the broad area of realistic, effective inservice education for experienced personnel, particularly in the new dimension of meeting needs of low-income and minority students. It's a whole new ball game, played in an entirely new ball park.

c) Major Strengths. The major strength of the Institute stemmed from the willingness of all participants to learn: college administrators, U.E.I. staff, trainees, training instructors, ghetto/barrio tutors, UCLA

seminar leaders and staff.

The urban crisis poses new and frightening demands; professionals need to learn from those who live the urban crisis and can't afford the luxury of prolonged conceptualization about it. In this reverse role for the professional lies the true inner strength of the Urban Education Institute. It was the rationale for the original proposal submitted in July 1969:

> ...no educational level is more challenged than the burgeoning community college. As a community based institution it has no alternative but to be involved in the urban crisis. One of the most serious stumbling blocks in the way of change lies in the hearts and minds of experienced personnel who were professionally trained to tackle problems of another day, another era. Even though committed to the open door philosophy, too many are geared to an educational system that screens out the unqualified, the "disadvantaged." To change to an approach that screens in the disadvantaged requires traumatic retooling...
>
> To meet the challenge of urban education in the raw, uptight community college personnel require more than a series of lectures on urban problems or a course or two in ethnic oriented studies. They need opportunities to interact as human beings with minorities, especially with minority residents of the innercity. At the present time, exposure to minorities occurs in situations where there is the temptation to overreact from positions of authority. Too often the result is confrontation. In short, community college personnel could do with affective Black/Brown Experiences.
>
> This proposal submits that Pasadena City College's urban community development core classes afford unique media for providing Black/Brown experiences for a selected number of community college faculty, counselors and administrators.

The Urban Education institute during 1970-71 field-tested the foregoing assumption. As already pointed out, it was found that urban careers classes enrolling New Careerists proved to be effective training media; they were more effective than ethnic studies classes. The Institute will continue to experiment with newly developed EOP tutorial learning centers as training media this coming year, 1971-72. The underlying assumption remains the same: the professional must turn himself around and open his mind to what the

low-income minority student can teach him. He, not the professional, knows what it truly means to be poor and discriminated against in the educational establishment.

Two other strengths of the Urban Education Institute deserve mention. The Institute places responsibility on community colleges for providing re-training media; it does not leave the inservice education job to the University. Also the Institute focuses on community practicum.

d) Plans for Program Development. See Section III C, Activities, for proposed changes during 1971-72, growing out of 1970-71 experiences. Special reference is made to minutes of Advisory Committee meeting July 13, 1971 (APPENDIX IV). 1971-72 operations are spelled out in those minutes, also significant changes to be incorporated into the 1972-73 proposal.

The 1972-73 proposal anticipates no increase in number of trainees. The proposal does request funds for additional activities: e.g., for a short-term institute for training instructors, also for a short-term institute for team training of U.E.I. designated administrators on each community college campus.

Respectfully submitted,

Ruth Macfarlane

Ruth Macfarlane, Director
Urban Education Institute

July 23, 1971

URBAN EDUCATION INSTITUTE

WHEN? Fall Semester 1970

WHERE? Pasadena City College, 1570 East Colorado Boulevard, Pasadena 91106

WHAT & WHY The Urban Education Institute is funded under Part E, Education Professions Development Act, P.L. 90-35. Its purpose is to retrain experienced community college personnel to work more effectively, and affectively, with increasing numbers of economically and educationally deprived minority students.

HOW? Retraining media will be Pasadena City College's urban community development work-study classes (see reverse side). Ninety percent of the students enrolled in these classes are nonprofessionals employed as aides in compensatory education and other antipoverty programs.

Each trainee will be assigned to a work-study class as an instructional assistant. In addition to regular attendance and participation in one class, he will go out into the community with one or more students who will serve as ghetto/barrio tutors. In other words, experienced college personnel will be retrained through involvement in black/brown experiences.

Trainees will be concurrently enrolled in a special evaluation seminar being designed by UCLA Extension. Most seminar activities will be either in the work-study classes, in the community, or in feedback seminars on the trainee's own campus.

Trainees will receive $600 for the semester's activities.

WHO? The Institute is open to administrators, counselors and faculty of those community colleges which are members of the Southern California College Consortium: Compton College, East Los Angeles College, Los Angeles City College and Pasadena City College.

Trainees will be selected in teams of five from each of the Consortium colleges. For applications, and further information, please contact

Jack Tatum, Compton College
Jack Smith, East Los Angeles College
Hope Holcomb, Los Angeles City College
Ruth Macfarlane, Pasadena City College

June 1970

Ruth Macfarlane, Director
Urban Education Institute
795-6961, Ex. 431

Pasadena City College - Fall Semester 1970

Socio 227/Socio 29	-	Sociology of the Afro-American Monday 7:00-10:00 p.m.	7 units*
Socio 227/Psych 29	-	Afro-American Psychology Monday 7:00-10:00 p.m.	7 units*
Socio 227/Socio 130	-	Introduction to Social Work Assisting Tuesday 2:30-5:30 p.m.	7 units*
**Socio 227/Pol Sc 130	-	Introduction to Government Assisting Tuesday 2:30-5:30 p.m.	7 units*
Socio 227/Pol Sc 131	-	Urban Political Problems Tuesday 7:00-10:00 p.m.	7 units*
Socio 227/Socio 31	-	Sociology of the Mexican-American Wednesday 2:30-5:30 p.m.	7 units*
Socio 227/Socio 125	-	Community Agencies Wednesday 2:30-5:30 p.m.	7 units*
Socio 227/Educ 130	-	Introduction to Educational Assisting Wednesday 2:30-5:30 p.m.	7 units*
Socio 227/Socio 29	-	Sociology of the Afro-American Thursday 2:30-5:30 p.m.	7 units*
Socio 227/Socio 127	-	Professional/Nonprofessional Roles Thursday 2:30-5:30 p.m.	7 units*

* 4 units of credit for Sociology 227, Community Field Practice; 3 units of credit for theory course.

** Subject to final approval of project funds under Title VIII, Housing Act 1964.

June 1970

URBAN EDUCATION INSTITUTE

WHEN? Spring Semester 1971.

WHERE? Compton College, East Los Angeles College, Los Angeles City College, Pasadena City College.

WHAT & WHY? The purpose of the Institute is to retrain experienced community college personnel to work more effectively, and affectively, with increasing numbers of low-income minority students. Opportunities for twenty-four trainees are available Spring semester. The Institute is funded under Part E, EPDA, - (Education Professions Development Act).

HOW? Retraining media are urban careers classes and related activities on four community college campuses (see reverse side). Each of the trainees will be assigned to a work-study class or to a study skills or counseling center. He will serve as an instructional assistant. In addition he will go out into the community with one or more ghetto/barrio tutors. In other words, college personnel will be retrained through involvement in black/brown experiences.

Trainees will be concurrently enrolled in a UCLA Extension Seminar in community involvement skills (three semester units of credit, at no cost to trainee). There will be a minimum of five half-day Saturday sessions of the seminar. The first session will be held January 30, 9:30-12:30, Compton College.

Trainees receive $600 for the semester's activities.

WHO? The Urban Education Institute is open to administrators, counselors and faculty of community college members of the Southern California Consortium: Compton College, East Los Angeles College, Los Angeles City College and Pasadena City College.

Each participating college is responsible for the recruitment and selection of its own team of trainees. For applications and further information, please communicate with:

Dr. John Grande, Compton College, 635-8081
Mr. Jack Smith, East Los Angeles College, 263-7261
Mrs. Hope Holcomb, Los Angeles City College, 663-9141
Dr. Stanley Gunstream, Pasadena City College, 795-6961

Ruth Macfarlane, Director
Urban Education Institute
795-6961, Ex. 431

January 1971

COMPTON COLLEGE (4 trainees)

History 9	The Black Man in Contemporary Society (Field Practice included) Michael Widener	W 6-9 p.m. Room: E-52
History 6	The Mexican American in Contemporary Society (Field Practice included) Adolfo Beremo	Th 7-10 p.m. Room: C-40

EAST LOS ANGELES COLLEGE (4-6 trainees)

Study Skills Center - peer counseling, S.B. 164 - hours to be arranged

Community Outreach, Satellite Study Skills Center (trailer) hours: t.b.a.

LOS ANGELES CITY COLLEGE (4-6 trainees)

Education 1	Introduction to Teaching (educational aides) Edison Junior High School 6500 Hooper Avenue, Los Angeles	M 3:30-6:30
Education 1	Introduction to Teaching (educational aides) Belvedere Junior High School 312 North Record Avenue, Los Angeles	M 3:30-6:30
Psychology 9	Introduction to College (S.B. 164 Program)	S 9-11, B 115
Developmental Communications 23	Techniques of Learning - hours to be arranged	Sierra Hall 121

PASADENA CITY COLLEGE (10-14 trainees)

*Socio 227/ Educ 130	Introduction to Educational Assisting	M 2:30-5:30
*Socio 227/127	Professional/Nonprofessional Roles: Government Assisting	T 2:30-5:30
*Socio 227/130	Introduction to Social Work Assisting	T 2:30-5:30
*Socio 227/ Pol Sc 131	Urban Political Problems	T 7-10 p.m.
*Socio 227/125	Community Agencies	Th 2:30-5:30
*Socio 227/127	Professional/Nonprofessional Roles: Educational Assisting	Th 2:30-5:30
*Socio 227/126	Urban Community Development	Th 7-10 p.m.

* 4 units of credit for Sociology 227, Community Field Practice (most of students are employed as nonprofessionals); 3 units of credit for theory course.

URBAN EDUCATION INSTITUTE
Fall Semester - 1970

ASSIGNED CLASS AT PASADENA CITY COLLEGE			INSTRUCTOR	TRAINEE
		COMPTON COLLEGE		
Socio 29	Sociology of Afro American Monday, 7-10 p.m.	Room 208W	Minta Palmer Brown	Charles H. Brown John A. Grande
Psych 29	Psychology of Afro American Monday, 7-10 p.m.	Room 212C	Shirley Better	Frances Washington
Educ 130	Intro. Educational Assisting Wed., 2:30-5:30 p.m.	Room 207C	Dr. Margaret Bennett	Roberta M. West
		EAST LOS ANGELES COLLEGE		
ocio 31	Sociology of Mexican American Wed., 2:30-5:30 p.m.	Room 211C	Henry Anaya	Mel Brunetti
Socio 130	Intro. Social Work Assisting Tues., 2:30-5:30 p.m.	Room 207C	Faye Munoz	Harry Brawer Solvejg Howard
		LOS ANGELES CITY COLLEGE		
Socio 127	Professional/Nonprofessional Roles Thurs., 2:30-5:30 p.m.	Room 206C	Henry Guzman	Mary E. Hanley Don Landauer
Pol Sc 130	Intro. Government Assisting Tues., 2:30-5:30 p.m.	Room 206C	Charles Clay	Frank Snedecor
ol Sc 131	Urban Political Problems Tues., 7-10 p.m.	Room 212C	Henry Guzman	Harriet Deitch
Educ 130	Intro. Educational Assisting Wed., 2:30-5:30 p.m.	Room 207C	Dr. Margaret Bennett	Lucille Lanz
		PASADENA CITY COLLEGE		
Socio 29	Sociology of Afro American Thurs., 2-5 p.m.	Room 212C	Jeffalyn Johnson	Elvio Angeloni
Socio 125	Community Agencies Wed., 2:30-5:30 p.m.	Room 208C	Ascencion Hernandez	Lionel E. Jacobs
Pol Sc 130	Intro. Government Assisting Tues., 2:30-5:30 p.m.	Room 206C	Charles Clay	Roland Sink
Pol Sc 131	Urban Political Problems Tues., 7-10 p.m.	Room 212C	Henry Guzman	Joyce Ball

URBAN EDUCATION INSTITUTE
Spring Semester - 1971

ASSIGNED CLASS/PROGRAM			COLLEGE	INSTRUCTOR	TRAINEE
		COMPTON COLLEGE			
Hist 6:	Mexican-Amer. in Contemp. Society				
	Th 7:00-10:00 p.m.	Room G-40	CC	Adolfo Barmeo	Charles Brown John Carroll John A. Grande
Hist 9:	Black Man in Contemporary Society				
	W 6:00-9:00 p.m.	Room E-52	CC	Michael Widener	Alejandro Fisher Frances Washington Roberta M. West
		EAST LOS ANGELES COLLEGE			
Community Outreach - Satellite Study Skills Center					
	T.B.A.		ELA	Ray Mireles Vincent Perez	Robert Landesman Frederick Obrecht Frederick Schwartz
Educ 1:	Introduction to Teaching (educational aides)				
	M 3:30-6:30 p.m.	Edison Jr. Hi.	LACC	Shirley Scott	Arthur Retig
Socio 125:	Community Agencies				
	Th 2:30-5:30 p.m.	Room 108R	PCC	Gwendolyn Edwards	Solvejg Howard
Socio 127:	Prof./Nonprof. Roles, Govt. Assisting				
	T 2:30-5:30 p.m.	Room 229C	PCC	Charles Clay	Neal Weichel
Socio 130:	Intro. to Social Work Assisting				
	T 2:30-5:30 p.m.	Room 108R	PCC	Faye Munoz	Louise McConnell
		LOS ANGELES CITY COLLEGE			
Educ 1:	Introduction to Teaching (educational aides)				
	M 3:30-6:30 p.m.	Edison Jr. Hi	LACC	Virginia Yearout	Kathleen Chatterton Mary E. Hanley
Level.					
Comm 23:	Techniques of Learning				
	T. B. A.	Sierra Hall 121	LACC	Kathleen Chatterton	Mary Geier
Psych 9:	Introduction to College				
	Sat 9:00-11:00 p.m.	Room B-115	LACC	Chadwick Woo	Kazuo Higa
Socio 125:	Community Agencies				
	Th 2:30-5:30 p.m.	Room 108R	PCC	Gwendolyn Edwards	Don Landauer
		PASADENA CITY COLLEGE			
Educ 130:	Intro. Educational Assisting				
	M 2:30-5:30 p.m.	Room 207C	PCC	Margaret Bennett	Lionel Jacobs Roland Sink
Pol Sc 131:	Urban Political Problems				
	T 7:00-10:00 p.m.	Room 212C	PCC	Henry Guzman	Margo R. Graham Joseph Muha
Socio 127:	Prof./Nonprof. Roles, Govt. Assisting				
	T 2:30-5:30 p.m.	Room 229C	PCC	Charles Clay	Wallace E. Calvert
Socio 130:	Intro. Social Work Assisting				
	T 2:30-5:30 p.m.	Room 108R	PCC	Faye Munoz	Ernest Neumann

APPENDIX III

Staffing Patterns - Urban Education Institute 1970-71

ADMINISTRATION

Director - approximately 15-20% released time; two semesters 1970-71

Dr. Ruth Macfarlane, Urban Community Development Specialist, Office of Occupational Education, Pasadena City College

Assistant Director - approximately 30%, spring semester; on contract

Mrs. Mary Jane Hewitt, Instructor, Occidental College; lecturer, University of California Los Angeles; free-lance writer and consultant on urban affairs, Black studies

U.E.I. Administrators - designated by each community college

Fall Semester

Compton College
Jack Tatum, Instructor, Social Sciences
East Los Angeles College
Jack Smith, Dean of Instruction
Los Angeles City College
Mrs. Hope Holcomb, Dean of Instruction
Pasadena City College
Ruth Macfarlane, Urban Community Development Specialist

Spring Semester

Compton College
Dr. John Grande, Dean of Instruction
East Los Angeles College
Bernard Butcher, Dean of Students
Los Angeles City College
Don Wilson, Assistant, Special Services
Pasadena City College
Dr. Stanley Gunstream, Administrative Dean for Instruction

INSTRUCTION

1) Training Media - regular instructors of scheduled classes/activities selected as training media; part-time, overload

Compton College

Adolfo Bermeo	-	History 6: Mexican American in Contemporary Society
Robert Gomez	-	Special Services
Michael Widener	-	History 9: Black Man in Contemporary Society

East Los Angeles College

Ray Mireles	-	Satellite Study Skills Center
Vincent Perez	-	" " " "

Los Angeles City College

Kathleen Chatterton	-	Devel. Comm. 23: Techniques of Learning
Shirley Scott	-	Ed 1: for COP trainees (see below)
Chadwick Woo	-	Psych 9: Introduction to College
Virginia Yearout	-	Ed 1: Introduction to Teaching, for trainees from Career Opportunities Program, Los Angeles Unified School District

Pasadena City College

Henry Anaya	-	Socio 31: Sociology of Mexican American
Dr. Margaret Bennett	-	Ed 130: Introduction to Educational Assisting, for teacher aides including COP Project Upbeat trainees
Shirley Better	-	Psych 29: Psychology of Afro American
Dr. Minta Brown	-	Socio 29: Sociology of Afro American
Charles Clay	-	Pol Sc 130: Introduction to Government Assisting, for HUD project trainees
	-	Socio 127: Professional/nonprofessional Roles, for HUD/project trainees
Henry Guzman	-	Pol Sc 131: Urban Political Problems
	-	Socio 127: Professional/nonprofessional Roles, for teacher aides, including COP trainees
Ascencion Hernandez	-	Socio 125: Community Agencies
Jeffalyn Johnson	-	Socio 29: Sociology of Afro American
Gwendolyn Keller	-	Socio 125: Community Agencies
Faye Munoz	-	Socio 130: Introduction to Social Work Assisting, for social work aides

INSTRUCTION - cont'd

2) UCLA Seminar

Mary Jane Hewitt, instructor/leader - part-time (see Asst. Director)

Dr. Richard Seligman, consultant on evaluation - part-time Acting Director, Center for the Study of Evaluation, Graduate School of Education, University of California Los Angeles

3) Community Practicum - part-time ghetto/barrio tutors selected from students enrolled in training media; majority employed as nonprofessionals in community agencies as identified in following roster

Compton College Training Media - spring semester

Antonio Amaya	-	active in MECHA
Shirley Brooks	-	community resident
Anna Jean Lucas	-	community resident
Rose Macias	-	active in MECHA
Willard Parks	-	community resident; employed at Watts Manufacturing Company
Aurelia Trujillo	-	community resident

East Los Angeles College Training Media - spring semester

*Armando Esparza	-	Department of Human Resources Development (not enrolled in training medium)
James Lucero	-	Mexican American Opportunities Foundation
Felix Orona	-	community resident

Los Angeles City College - spring semester

Tony Dudley, Jr.	-	Career Opportunities Program (COP), Los Angeles Unified School District
Lucille Gallon	-	COP, Manchester School, Los Angeles
Juanita Hernandez	-	COP, Lillian School, Los Angeles
William Nakamatsu	-	Special Services, LACC campus
Oliver Nowlin	-	community resident

INSTRUCTION - cont'd

Pasadena City College	-	fall semester
*Raquel Alvarado	-	School Community Resources Involvement Project (SCRIP), Mountain View School District
Toni Bonillas	-	Follow Through, Garvey School District
Shirley Brown	-	Foothill Family Service, Pasadena
*Vera Chavez	-	Follow Through, Mountain View School District
Eva Davalos	-	SCRIP, Alhambra City School District
Lucille Davis	-	Department of Public Social Services, Pasadena
*Armando Esparza	-	Department of Human Resources Devel.
Ruben Gomez	-	Pasadena Commission on Human Need and Opportunity (PCHNO)
La Nita Green	-	PCHNO
Mae Moore	-	Head Start, Duarte
Margaret Parry	-	Head Start, Pasadena
*Frank Trejo	-	Community Services Center, Catholic Welfare Bureau, Los Angeles
Horace Wormely	-	Neighborhood Youth Corps, PCHNO

Pasadena City College	-	spring semester
*Raquel Alvarado	-	SCRIP, Mountain View School District
Margaret Arrendell	-	Pasadena Mental Health Agency
Lilyan Bianco	-	Teacher Aide, Jefferson School, Pasadena Unified School District
William Bradley	-	E.E.O. Program, Pasadena Post Office
*Vera Chavez	-	Follow Through, Mountain View School District
Josephine Farias	-	Follow Through, Mountain View School District
Emelie Goodridge	-	Head Start, El Monte
Esther Ortiz	-	Department of Public Social Service East Los Angeles
Karan Stanford	-	Follow Through, Mountain View School District
Charles Taliaferro	-	Community Relations, City of Pasadena
*Frank Trejo	-	Community Service Center, Catholic Welfare Bureau, Los Angeles

* served as tutor both semesters

PASADENA CITY COLLEGE
1570 EAST COLORADO BOULEVARD
PASADENA, CALIFORNIA 91106

URBAN EDUCATION INSTITUTE

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA COLLEGE CONSORTIUM
Sub-Committee on Urban Education Institute

July 13, 1971

PRESENT;

UCLA	Dr. Robert B. Kindred Dr. Richard Seligman
Compton College	Dr. John A. Grande
East Los Angeles College	Mr. Henry Cobos (representing Mr. Butcher)
Los Angeles City College	
Pasadena City College	Dr. Stanley E. Gunstream Mr. Edward Hernandez
Trainee Representatives	Mr. Don Landauer, LACC Mrs. Roberta West, Compton
Tutor Representative	Mr. Joseph Vasquez (representing Mr. Esparza)

Ex Officio:

Dr. Ruth Macfarlane, Director, Urban Education Institute
Mrs. Mary Jane Hewitt, Assistant Director, Spring 1971; Seminar leader 1970-71

The meeting convened at 10:45 a.m. in Room 404, Catherine J. Robbins Building, Pasadena City College, under the chairmanship of Dr. Gunstream.

Minutes of the last meeting of the Sub-Committee, June 9, 1971, were approved as submitted.

IMPLEMENTATION OF 1971-72 INSTITUTE

The committee took the following actions relative to 1971-72 operations of the Urban Education Institute:

1) acknowledged as final but with regret Mary Jane Hewitt's reiterated statement that she would not be available to serve either as seminar leader or as assistant director;

2) accordingly, reaffirmed previous recommendation (meeting June 9, 1971) to effect that direction of the U.E.I. be decentralized through the use of a team leader on each campus, using for this purpose one-half of budgetary item approved for part-time assistant director (one-half of $8,000);

3) recommended that for three reasons PCC not consider assigning a one-fourth time assistant director with the balance of the money approved for the job: overload assignment of this magnitude not realistic, creating conflict of interest; adequate released time for a qualified faculty member not feasible at this late date; too much diffusion of administrative responsibility;

4) instead, strongly recommended that each cooperating community college assume greater administrative leadership along two fronts, thus relieving the director of the many onerous responsibilities which prompted the appointment of an assistant director spring semester 1971:

a) assignment of U.E.I. adminstration to a dean closely identified with if not acutally responsible for development of inservice education of college staff; and

b) his close supervision of a team leader as indicated in Item 2, above;

5) stipulated that the team leader be reimbursed no more than $1,000 ($500 each semester), it being understood that this amount would also cover mileage outlays;

6) recommended that the team leader be nominated by trainees and appointed by designated U.E.I. administrator, subject to final approval by the prime contractor;

7) approved suggested list of duties for team leader (see attached job description), with endorsement of Mrs. Hewitt's observation that the quality of the team leader's performance would depend as much on his college's institutional commitment and administrative leadership as on his own background, initiative, and missionary zeal;

8) suggested that salary available for a one-fourth time assistant director ($4,000) might be used for more equitable reimbursement of tutors provided their responsibilities could be more clearly delineated;

9) stipulated that in the meantime tutor's honorarium as now approved by the budget, i.e., $100 per semester, be based on coordinated community practicum with trainee, also on involvement in at least two on-campus team meetings, but in no more than one group session of the seminar;

10) confirmed previous recommendation that each college be responsible for recruitment and selection of its own team, and that trainees be limited to two semesters of participation;

11) endorsed emerging plans for the UCLA seminar as described by Dr. Kindred based on communications between him and the director, as follows:

a) trainees and team leaders to be granted three semester units of credit, but no credit to be granted to training instructors. - maximum of 48 to be granted credit during year;

b) seminar to provide each semester approximately 40-45 "contact" hours with one or more of a team of UCLA instructors:

group session - a minimum of three Saturday mornings	9 "contact" hours
weekend retreat	12-15 "contact" hours
team meetings 2 per campus	6 "contact" hours
practicum in community with tutor .	15+ "contact" hours

c) UCLA Extension to certify U.E.I. director as seminar leader, thus legitimizing necessary contact hours provided by her and her staff; to include team leaders as joint supervisors with tutors of community practicum and as leaders of on-campus team meetings; community resource leader for Saturday and weekend retreat group sessions; experienced trainer for weekend retreat;

d) extent of continued involvement of the Center for the Study of Evaluation still to be determined.

1972-73 URBAN EDUCATION INSTITUTE

The committee took action as follows on the 1972-73 proposal which must be submitted before the end of the month (to be date-stamped no later than July 31):

1) stipulated that prime contractor (Pasadena City College) assume that the Southern California Consortium will continue to be involved in the Institute;

2) further stipulated that prime contractor assume that the four community colleges now participating in the Institute will continue to do so by providing trainees as well as training media;

3) requested that necessary letters of commitment, to be attached to the proposal, be submitted to the prime contractor by July 21, 1971;

4) reaffirmed Institute's original goals and objectives particularly as they apply to three of EDPA/E's high priority areas for training during 1972-73, as set forth in covering letter transmitting guidelines:

a) acquainting educators with the culture, life experience, and attitudes of low income and minority students;

b) student personnel services, including counseling and career placement and special problems of recruiting low-income and minority students; and

c) student financial aid programs.

5) approved 1972-73 staffing patterns proposed by prime contractor:

a) coordinating responsibility to be assumed by Pasadena City College's Administrative Dean for Instruction;

b) director to be provided by prime contractor on basis of 40%-50% released time for certificated staff member, selection to be made sufficiently in advance to avoid difficulties experienced in implementing 1971-72 program;

c) present director to be written into 1972-73 program as a consultant (in order to provide needed continuity after her retirement from the College June 1972);

d) continued decentralization through team leaders, whose utilization is being field-tested 1971-72;

6) reaffirmed commitment to more effective channeling of Urban Education Institute into administrative mainstream of each cooperating community college, by institutionalizing still further the 1971-72 changes suggested by formative evaluation during 1970-71:

a) dropping ethnic studies classes as training media in favor of urban careers classes or other media which enroll higher proportions of nonprofessionals/New Careerists, who experience has indicated make the most effective tutors;

b) utilizing other training media, e.g., Student Resources Centers and other EOP on-campus and community tutorial and counseling centers;

c) de-emphasizing confrontation as a training technique since experience has shown that confrontation for the sake of confrontation, whether in the training media or in the community, soon reaches the point of diminishing returns, and has proved to be self-defeating;

d) selecting ghetto/barrio tutors more carefully, reimbursing them more equitably for over and beyond regular agency duties, and coordinating/supervising community practicum with tutors more closely;

e) orienting training media instructors more effectively to goals and objectives of Institute;

f) making the university seminar component more action oriented, with greater emphasis upon the community practicum through team leaders;

g) selecting community college teams more carefully in terms of trainee commitment and in terms of institutional willingness to integrate Institute training with ongoing or envisioned inservice education.

EVALUATION

Dr. Seligman, Acting Director of the Center for the Study of Evaluation, Graduate School of Education, UCLA, advised the committee that his office had tabulated the questionnaires designed by him and U.E.I. staff for trainees, training instructors and tutors. He found most of the completed questionnaires exceedingly positive, much more so than he had expected. He was not entirely satisfied with the format nor the structure of the questionnaire, however; at best it was a pedestrian effort.

Much discussion followed on how best to measure attitudinal and behavioral changes experienced by trainees. Several instruments are available to measure attitudinal changes. The problem, not unique to the Urban Education Institute, lies with measurement of significant changes in behavior. It was suggested that student reactions to changing trainee behavior, if any, in trainees' on-going classes might be measured. Another suggestion was to allow tutors to visit these classes and determine their trainees' changing behavior.

No action was taken per se relative to evaluation except to recognize the need to seek out more effective ways to measure desired behavioral change.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 11:50 a.m., to reconvene at the call of the U.E.I. director.

Respectfully submitted,

Ruth Macfarlane

Ruth Macfarlane, Secretary pro tem
July 17, 1971

Sub-committee on Urban Education Institute, 7/13/71

TEAM LEADER

	Duties	Hours
1.	to be responsible for a minimum of two three-hour, or three two-hour meetings of team per semester, to coordinate U.E.I. program on campus and at same time to serve as seminar sessions (team leader to be certificated by UCLA as assistant to seminar leader) . .	12
2.	to attend monthly meetings of team leaders with U.E.I. director, Pasadena City College (joint sessions with seminar leader)	30
3.	to assist in group meetings of seminar (3 Saturdays per semester, two weekend retreats during year)	18 + 30
4.	to visit training media periodically and report to U.E.I. campus administrator, and to U.E.I. director	20
5.	to run interference on forms: applications, contracts, evaluations, invoices	20
		130

Reimbursement: $500 per semester, $1,000 per year, - for 130 hours averages $7.70 per hour (130 hours includes some travel time; reimbursement covers mileage)

Qualifications: 1) experience as a trainee
2) rapport with members of team

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA COLLEGE CONSORTIUM
Sub-Committee on Urban Education Institute

June 9, 1971

PRESENT:

UCLA . . . . . Dr. Robert Kindred

Compton College. . . . . Mr. Alejandro Fisher (for Dr. Grande)
Mrs. Roberta West, Trainee

East Los Angeles College . . . . . Mr. Bernard Butcher

Los Angeles City College . . . . . .

Pasadena City College . . . . . Dr. Stanley Gunstream

Ex Officio:

Dr. Ruth Macfarlane, Director, Urban Education Institute
Mrs. Mary Jane Hewitt, Assistant Director, Urban Education Institute

The meeting convened at 10:12 a.m. in the President's Conference Room, East Los Angeles College, under the chairmanship of Dr. Ruth Macfarlane.

Minutes — Minutes of the last meeting of the Sub-Committee, April 27, 1971, were approved as submitted.

Budget, 1971-72 — Dr. Macfarlane reported that the budget for next year's Urban Education Institute had been submitted to Washington. It is essentially the same as for this year with the exception that the allocation for the Assistant Director's position has been increased to provide more administrative/coordinative supervision of the program.

Discussion — Dr. Gunstream raised the age-old question regarding the balance of payments to trainees and tutors and expressed the desire that we resolve it once and for all so that it does not continue to plague us.

Mrs. West recommended that there be closer supervision of the community experience undertaken by the trainee with a tutor.

Mr. Butcher recommended that there be a team leader on each campus--perhaps an alumnus of the current year's Institute.

Mrs. Hewitt expressed the feeling that a top administrative officer should not be expected to participate as a trainee, but he could provide coodination on his campus and disseminate Institute information.

Dr. Gunstream agreed that there should be a coordinator on each participating community college campus, and that his duties should be clearly spelled out. Dr. Macfarlane urged that the Dean of Instruction provide the overall leadership and the team leader might report to him. Mrs. Hewitt urged that the team leader be selected from among this year's trainees, that a portion of the Assistant Director allocation be re-allocated to provide a stipend of perhaps $1,000.00 per year to each team leader to encourage his conscientious supervision of each team. This would reduce the size of the overload on a certificated person who might take on the Assistant Director assignment and make it more feasible. It would also insure experienced supervision of each campus team.

Training Media

A. ELAC — Both concentrated employment program and new careers activities will be available, as well as the Campus Study Skills Center.

B. PCC — In addition to new careers classes, there will be a Consumer Education Mobile Unit operative and the Extended Opportunities Program available as training media.

C. LACC — New careers classes will continue to be offered.

D. Compton — A Manpower Resources Program under Model Cities and the SB 164 Counseling/Study Skills Center will be available as training media.

Advantages and disadvantages of trainees signing up for training media on their own campuses as opposed to involvement on another campus were discussed. Mrs. Hewitt felt that location should not be the first consideration, but that the best media for the trainee's purposes should be the major criterion. Mrs. West observed that she had enrolled at PCC during the Fall semester's program and she learned a lot about Pasadena and Duarte, but that was not of much help to her in aiding Compton students. By undertaking her training at Compton during the Spring semester, she learned more about Compton's community services which prepared her to better serve the students on her own campus. The consensus was that trainees should have the option to choose their media, and that no conditions as to location should be imposed.

Assistant Director — Ideally, the person chosen as Assistant Director should come on board July 1st, but realistically, he should begin his work by September 1st at the very latest.

UCLA Seminar — Mrs. Hewitt observed that this is the weakest link in the Institute design as presently constituted. When trainees, training instructors, and tutors attend (which is most of the time), the group can be as large as 40 or more persons. Dr. Macfarlane pointed out that unless we include the community practicum as part of the seminar requirement, the number of hours a trainee commits is perhaps less than should be required for the number of unit credits granted. Dr. Kindred proposed that 3 quarter units (equivalent to 2 semester units) would be easier to justify in terms of time commitment--contact class hours plus practicum. Dr. Gunstream proposed that inplace of 5 all campus Saturday seminars and 2 team meetings per campus, we go to 2 all campus Saturday seminars and 3 team

meetings per campus.

Seminar Design, 1971-72 — Dr. Kindred felt that 3 quarter units of credit could be justified with the following design which all agreed to:

1. On campus orientation September 17 or 18.

2. Arrowhead weekend retreat October 1 - 3, the first evening of which would be orientation review; the remainder of the weekend being devoted to explorations into self-and-other awareness, for trainees only.

3. Two all campus Saturday seminar sessions--one at mid-semester and one at the conclusion of the semester.

Trainee Selection — Dr. Gunstream stressed the importance of selecting trainees for next year before this semester ends and that trainees be informed as to their responsibilities as trainees. It was agreed that whatever amount of funds feasible be squeezed out to be allocated to tutor payments for next year.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary J. Hewitt

Mary Jane Hewitt
Secretary Pro Tem

June 15, 1971

PASADENA CITY COLLEGE
1570 EAST COLORADO BOULEVARD
PASADENA, CALIFORNIA 91106

URBAN EDUCATION INSTITUTE

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA COLLEGE CONSORTIUM
Sub-Committee on Urban Education Institute

April 27, 1971

PRESENT:

UCLA	Dr. Simon Gonzalez Dr. Richard Seligman
Compton College	Mrs. Roberta West, Trainee Mrs. Frances Washington, Trainee
East Los Angeles College	Mr. Bernard Butcher
Los Angeles City College	
Pasadena City College	Dr. E. Howard Floyd

Ex Officio:

Dr. Ruth Macfarlane, Director, Urban Education Institute
Mrs. Mary Jane Hewitt, Assistant Director, Urban Education Institute

The meeting convened at 1:30 p.m. in the Faculty Dining Room, Pasadena City College.

Chairman of Sub-Committee

Clarification was sought of the question as to who is to chair meetings of the Sub-committee. (See letter of April 6, 1971 from Dr. Simon Gonzalez to Dr. Ruth Macfarlane clarifying his role as he perceived it vis a vis Consortium sponsored projects.)

Although Dr. Gonzalez functioned as Chairman pro tem of the Sub-committee's March 11 meeting, he did not want this to signify that he was to assume responsibility in other matters related to the Urban Education Institute. A differentiation was made among the three interacting components--the Consortium, the Sub-committee on the Urban Education Institute, and the Project Direction of the Urban Education

(over)

Institute. Dr. Gonzalez saw the Chairman of the Sub-committee as the project director of the Consortium sponsored project in question, (in this instance, Dr. Macfarlane). Dr. Floyd agreed, expressing the view that the Consortium ought to have one chairman and there could be as many sub-committee chairmen as there were Consortium sponsored projects underway.

It was moved by Mr. Butcher, seconded by Dr. Floyd, that the principal investigator or project director of each project serve as chairman of the Consortium sub-committee for that project. The motion passed.

Minutes

In light of the above discussion, Minutes of the March 11 Sub-committee meeting were corrected by striking the last phrase of the last sentence ("in conference with Dr. Gonzalez"), which inferred that Dr. Gonzalez would be responsible for calling meetings related to the Urban Education Institute. Dr. Floyd moved approval of the Minutes of the March 11 meeting as corrected. Mr. Butcher seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Review of the Urban Education Institute's Structural History

A. Types of Retraining Media

Three types of retraining media were used spring semester 1971:

1. New Careerist adult classes
2. Ethnic studies classes
3. Study skills centers--on campus and in the community

The consensus was that retraining media of types 1 and 3 should continue to be used. Students in classes designed for New Careerists are more homogeneous than those in ethnic studies classes. Those in the former tend to be more mature and more community involved because of their work than those in the ethnic studies classes who are younger and, for the most part, not far beyond the rhetoric stage.

Since the purpose of assigning Institute trainees to retraining classes is to provide them an opportunity to gain insight into the problems and strengths of disadvantaged minority group members, the first and third type of media cited above tend to suit the Institute's purposes more effectively than does type #2. Experience has shown that the maturity level of Institute trainees and New Careerists facilitates the establishment of rapport between them.

B. Criteria for Trainee Selection

Dr. Gonzalez questioned whether the trainees selected for the Institute "needed" it. Mrs. Hewitt expressed the view that those who needed it most could not be persuaded to participate. They would tend to be resistant to this type of activity. Instead, those who can benefit from the experience are sought and an attempt is made to instill in them a missionary zeal

to proselytize among their colleagues as a result of the experience. The philosophy is one of long-term commitment to educational and social change for the benefit of all students.

C. Activities Resulting from Institute Program — Representatives of participating institutions and the two trainees present reported on some of the activities to date resulting from participation in the Institute.

Pasadena City College's trainees and tutors prepared a panel presentation for a PCC Faculty meeting.

Compton College's trainees organized and participated in a day-long Community Awareness conference at their college and have formed a Campus Community Awareness Committee.

East Los Angeles College will involve as many Institute trainees as possible in its projected College/Community conference to be held this spring under the auspices of the Title III program at the College.

Los Angeles City College trainees have designed a many-pronged plan to saturate the campus with information about the Institute starting with a presentation to department chairmen council meeting, preparation of a newsletter for dissemination throughout the college, and an article for the campus newspaper.

D. Credit — Trainees receive UCLA professional credit for participation in the seminar which is part of the Institute program (4½ quarter units or 3 semester units), as well as community college units if they enroll in assigned retraining classes.

E. Relationships: Training Instructor/Trainee/Tutor — The importance of the tutor/trainee relationship was discussed as well as the role of the training instructor in (1) facilitating the selection by the trainee of a tutor from among his classmates in the retraining classes, and (2) in drawing upon the skills of the trainee in assisting in the retraining classes.

F. Payments to Trainees/Training Instructors/Tutors — Dr. Macfarlane explained the rationale behind the fee, or stipend payments to the three groups.

Trainees are paid $600 as "instructional assistants." The assumption is that if they were to teach an evening class, they would receive that compensation, at least. Instead, they are being asked to be involved in a class one afternoon or night per week as a student/assistant, spend three hours per week, at least, in the community with a ghetto or barrio tutor, and participate in the UCLA seminar.

Training instructors are paid $100 per trainee for working with the trainee in the classroom and for participating in the UCLA seminar.

(over)

Tutors (New Careerists) are being paid what amounts to baby-sitting and transportation money, plus a little extra, for participating with the trainee in the UCLA seminar. Care is taken to avoid paying the Tutor twice for the same activity--that is, his work in his community is his job. If he takes a trainee with him into the community to a meeting or to visit a client, he is simply taking an observer along with him as he does his job. Participation in the Saturday seminar is over and above his regular work, and it is for this that he is paid.

The tutor honorarium has been a bone of contention, the tutor feeling, very often, that the higher paid professional is paid a higher stipend for his participation, while the lower paid non-professional, who is the expert in this instance, is paid less. It was reiterated, however, that the investment of time on the part of the trainee is far greater (over and above his regular assignment at his college). Trainees present supported this position.

The elected tutor representatives were not present. Mrs. Hewitt related their feeling that compensation to tutors and trainees ought to be more equitable. Dr. Macfarlane pointed up the sensitivity of the matter vis a vis agency heads who are concerned lest dissension arise among new careerists selected as tutors who are compensated extra for doing the same work as their co-workers because they take an observer (the trainee) with them when they do it, and those not selected are envious. Dr. Floyd recalled the furor over tutor payments at the end of the fall semester and hoped this would be avoided spring semester. Mrs. Washington questioned the need of a tutor, feeling that the same kind of insights might be obtained by a highly motivated trainee on his own. Mrs. West valued the involvement with a tutor and saw him as another kind of missionary, a positive force for campus/community rapport. It was agreed that the tutor should be selected by the trainee with the advice and help of the training instructor.

Budget - 1971-72

Mr. Butcher moved that the intent of the budget submitted by Dr. Macfarlane be approved. Dr. Floyd seconded the motion. Motion carried. The question of mileage for trainees as well as for the half-time project director arose. It was pointed out that there was no fat in the budget for extra items not already included. The funding is at the same level as the previous year.

Instruction Design - 1971-72

Mrs. Hewitt sought observations regarding the three alternative training designs she presented. Whereas she expressed a preference for the third alternative (two groups, one following the current design with the exception of greater mutuality of exchange between the tutor and the trainee, while the second group has the added ingredient of sensitivity training), no determination was made as to which plan should be followed in the coming year. It was proposed, however, that care might be taken to match males with males and females with females in the selection of tutors by trainees.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m., to reconvene at the call of the chair.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Jane Hewitt
Secretary Pro Tem

PASADENA CITY COLLEGE
1570 EAST COLORADO BOULEVARD
PASADENA, CALIFORNIA 91106

URBAN EDUCATION INSTITUTE

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA COLLEGE CONSORTIUM
Sub-Committee on Urban Education Institute

March 11, 1971

PRESENT:

UCLA	Dr. Simon Gonzalez Dr. Robert Kindred Dr. Richard Seligman
Compton College	Dr. John Grande Mrs. Roberta West, Trainee
East Los Angeles College	Mr. Bernard Butcher
Los Angeles City College	Mrs. Hope Holcomb Mr. Don Landauer, Trainee
Pasadena City College	Dr. E. Howard Floyd Mrs. Shirley Brown, Tutor

Ex Officio:

Dr. Ruth Macfarlane, Director, Urban Education Institute
Mrs. Mary Jane Hewitt, Assistant Director, Urban Education Institute

Dr. Simon Gonzalez, chairman pro tem, called the meeting to order at 1:10 p.m., Regents Dining Room, Murphy Hall 2138, UCLA.

New Members Additions to the sub-committee since the last meeting were noted, and new members greeted: Mrs. Shirley Brown, tutor; two trainees: Mrs. West and Mr. Landauer. The second tutor representative elected by tutors at the March 6th seminar session is Mr. Armando Esparza; the alternative tutor member is Mrs. Vera Chavez. Neither Mr. Esparza nor Mrs. Chavez was able to attend on such short notice.

Minutes Minutes of the last meeting of the sub-committee, December 22, 1970, were accepted as submitted.

Sub-committee on Urban Education Institute, 3/11/71 #2

Spring Semester Contracts It was recommended that the Institute staff should devise contract forms, one for trainees and one for the training instructor. Suggested forms should be submitted to each participating college for necessary adaptation to its specific needs. Trainee and tutor representatives will be glad to assist in the development of the form.

Assistant Director Mrs. Hewitt, newly appointed assistant director of the Institute, reported on activities since her assignment the middle of February. They have been primarily concerned with follow-up or feedback on each of the four community college campuses. She plans to visit retraining classes/activities to which trainees are assigned.

In her capacity as seminar instructor Mrs. Hewitt is also holding sessions with each campus' team of trainees.

Of necessity there will be some overlap between Mrs. Hewitt's dual responsibilities; for payroll purposes careful time records will be kept.

It was the sense of the meeting that the Institute is indeed fortunate to be able to have the seminar instructor serve as assistant director. Such an assignment promises to give needed depth to the Institute spring semester.

Site Visit Dr. Seligman reported on the site visit made by Dr. Paul Shapiro and Dr. Hans Radhuth, both from the Center for Education Policy Research, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University. The Center has a contract from the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development to evaluate EPDA/E projects. Dr. Shapiro and Dr. Radhuth spent considerable time March 4 and 5 with Dr. Seligman; they also attended the UCLA seminar session held March 6 on the PCC campus. Following the seminar they conferred at some length with the director of the Institute.

It is not certain at this time if a copy of their evaluation will be made available to Institute staff.

1971-72 Project The subcommittee discussed implications of the 1971-72 award which is in the same amount as this year's, i.e., $57,000. Several recommendations emerged to guide staff in drafting a working copy of the "Final Plan of Operation:"

1 The Consortium as now constituted should continue to sponsor the 1971-72 Urban Education Institute.

2 Participation in the 1971-72 Institute should be limited to present community college members: Compton, East Los Angeles, Los Angeles City, and Pasadena City Colleges.

3 Honoraria to be paid trainees (now $600 per semester) should be more equably related to the smaller stipend now being paid tutors ($100 per semester), keeping in mind that honoraria/ stipends are authorized under the guidelines for different purposes and with different restrictions.

4 There should be at least a half-time director.

5 Classroom activity experiences of trainees in selected re-training media need to be supervised/coordinated more effectively by instructors/supervisors if the purposes of the Institute are to be realized.

6 Community experiences of trainees with or without tutors need to be closely defined so that there is a common base of requirements by each training institution.

7 The sub-committee needs to meet again very shortly to round out more specific recommendations for the 1971-72 "Final Plan of Operation" which should be submitted to Washington by May 1, 1971.

8 The fall semester Institute needs to be implemented before the end of this spring semester. Waiting until September results in confusion and delayed starting.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:25 p.m., to reconvene if at all possible on Saturday, March 27, following the scheduled seminar session being held at Pasadena City College; otherwise at the call of the director in conference with Dr. Gonzalez.*

Respectfully submitted,

Ruth Macfarlane

Ruth Macfarlane, Secretary Pro Tem.

* March 25, 1971: meeting not called for March 27, 1971.

3/25/71

PASADENA CITY COLLEGE
1570 EAST COLORADO BOULEVARD
PASADENA, CALIFORNIA 91106

URBAN EDUCATION INSTITUTE

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA COLLEGE CONSORTIUM
Sub-Committee on Urban Education Institute

January 22, 1971

PRESENT:

UCLA	Dr. Robert Kindred Dr. Richard Seligman
Compton College	Dr. John Grande
East Los Angeles College . . .	Mr. Jack Smith Mr. Bernard Butcher
Los Angeles City College . . .	Mrs. Hope Holcomb
Pasadena City College	Dr. Stanley E. Gunstream

Also present:

Dr. Ruth Macfarlane (Director, Urban Education Institute)

Invited but unable to attend:

Mrs. Mary Jane Hewitt (Instructor, UCLA U.E.I. Seminar)

- - - - -

The meeting was called to order at 10:10 a.m. by Ruth Macfarlane, Chairman pro tem, in Room 139, Administration Building, East Los Angeles College. The following actions were taken:

1 Assistant Director. It was recommended that Mary Jane Hewitt be invited to serve as assistant director, February 1 - June 30, 1971. Necessary funds to cover the part-time assignment will be transferred to UCLA Extension as a supplement to existing contract.

2 Honoraria. In determining final honoraria for first semester for the trainees, tutors, and supervising instructors, director will need to be guided by routine evaluations already distributed. Trainee recommendations will determine amount of stipends for tutors. It was expected that honoraria would cover participation in at least three seminar sessions.

3 Participant Attendance. Training instructors should attend a minimum of three seminar sessions during a semester. Trainees should be held to the same attendance rules as govern students in the retraining classes to which they are assigned.

4 Evaluation of Trainee. A "before and after" evaluation of trainees in the affective area as demonstrated in the classroom is manifestly impossible,

according to Dr. Seligman. For one thing the U.E.I. as a model is not structured nor is it funded to encompass such in-depth evaluation. Present forms are adequate for now, but there should be a more sophisticated approach spring semester, looking to the final report on the Institute.

From verbal evaluations at the January 30 session of the seminar a list of questions for more comprehensive spring semester forms will be compiled. With an assistant director on the job it will be possible to be more thorough the second time around.

5 Orientation, Spring Semester. The sub-committee reiterated the need for more effective orientation of trainees and of training instructors. The January 30 session of the seminar will begin such orientation. The assistant director will be able to follow on each campus.

6 Selection of Trainees, Spring Semester. Two points of view emerged. One was that fall semester trainees should have priority. The other was that new applicants should have priority. Two colleges (Compton and East Los Angeles) are reselecting fall semester teams. Two hold-overs from Los Angeles City College are being selected as trainees. Two of Pasadena City College's nine applicants are hold-overs. With a team of six authorized for spring semester, selection presents a problem. The consensus was that each college should make its own selection, on the basis of what is best for the college.

7 Assignment to Retraining Media. With two exceptions applicants wish retraining on their own campuses. Final assignments need to be made immediately so that retraining instructors can attend the orientation session January 30.

8 Registration in Retraining Classes. Where the retraining medium is a regular class, it was recommended that the trainee actually enroll as a student.

9 Seminar Schedule. The spring semester UCLA seminar calls for a minimum of five Saturday morning sessions. The first is January 30, Compton College. The remaining four sessions will be scheduled by trainees/instructors January 30. Tutors are to be involved in a minimum of three sessions spring semester, as contemplated in the original proposal and the final plan of operation.

10 Additional Retraining Medium. Compton College announced a third retraining medium (Educational Opportunity Program), making it possible for Compton to accommodate six trainees.

11 Minutes, Meeting 12/1/70. Minutes stand approved as submitted, with one addition to Item 8, page 5, as follows:

> UCLA seminar credit for two semesters needs to be clarified. Dr. Floyd suggested that each college be responsible for determining whether or not more than one semester's credit be accepted for meeting hurdle or other personnel requirements.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m., to reconvene at the call of the chair.

Respectfully submitted,

Ruth Macfarlane

1-25-71

PASADENA CITY COLLEGE
1570 EAST COLORADO BOULEVARD
PASADENA, CALIFORNIA 91106

URBAN EDUCATION INSTITUTE

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA COLLEGE CONSORTIUM
Sub-Committee on Urban Education Institute

December 1, 1970

PRESENT:

UCLA	Dr. Robert Kindred
	Dr. Richard Seligman
Compton College	Mrs. Roberta West (for Dr. John Grande)
East Los Angeles College	Mr. Jack Smith
Los Angeles City College	Mrs. Mary Eileen Hanley (for Mrs. Hope Holcomb)
Pasadena City College	Dr. E. Howard Floyd

Also present:

Dr. Ruth Macfarlane (Director, Urban Education Institute)
Mrs. Mary Jane Hewitt (Instructor, UCLA U.E.I. Seminar)
Mr. Henry Guzman (Instructor, PCC Retraining Classes for U.E.I.)

The chairman pro tem (Ruth Macfarlane was volunteered) called the meeting to order at 10:15 a.m., in Room 139 Administration Building, East Los Angeles College.

TRAINEE TRAUMA

Mrs. Hewitt made a report on the Institute's UCLA Seminar. Two group meetings have been held, October 3 and November 14. In between, team meetings were held on each of the four community college campuses. Marked trainee trauma was revealed at the group meeting on November 14. The sub-committee proceeded to analyze the trainee concerns undergirding overt discontent.

The first concern erupting at the November 14th meeting related to the additional group meetings being scheduled. This was a trainee decision arrived at during the first go-round of campus team meetings. Trainees indicated a preference for additional Saturaday group meetings in lieu of further team meetings on each campus. At the November 14th meeting, however, a dissenting minority of trainees was highly critical. Mrs. Hewitt reported that before the end of that session the group reconfirmed its decision to hold additional Saturday meetings.

A second trainee concern articulated at the November 14th meeting stems from seminar "assignments." Mrs. Hewitt reported that trainees themselves had suggested the assignments during team meetings on each campus. Delayed reaction set in as trainees began to implement their own suggestions. Evidently they were not meeting "felt" trainee needs after all. At the last seminar session many trainees as well as several training instructors said that they could see no connection between assignments and experiences in the training classes.

A third trainee concern goes below surface dissidence. The basic question seems to be: how does a trainee cope with hostility? Being a target of hostility is a new experience for most trainees; it can be harrowing. Trainees look to the seminar sessions to assist them in developing greater hostility tolerance. "Assignments" merely get in the way. Since two members of the sub-committee meeting on December 1st were also trainees (Mrs. Hanley and Mrs. West) there was opportunity to amplify trainee points of view. Mrs. Hanley particularly felt that trainees should be better prepared for the shock of overt hostility; there should be more extensive orientation in "how to cope."

Sub-committee discussion brought to light another side to the question of orientation. Some members felt that no amount of orientation could or should offer the kind of insulation some trainees feel they want. The entire retraining process provided by the Institute is a kind of shock therapy in human relations.

A fourth trainee concern is identified with the role confusion being experienced by trainees. Is the trainee an "instructional assistant" or is he a "student" in the retraining class? Speaking as a trainee as well as for other trainees from Los Angeles City College, Mrs. Hanley emphasized the need for a clear-cut definition of roles. To her and some other trainees, it is a case of either-or, not both.

The need for each trainee to do his own thing in his training class was posited, counterbalancing the expressed need, even demand, for more specific role definition. Discussion brought out that each trainee needs to define his own role or roles, based not on some committee's preconceived, formalized definitions or on finely honed behavioral objectives, but on the trainee's ongoing experiences in the training class and in the community with his "tutor." There was general agreement that the seminar should serve to help him define his roles.

Role confusion is compounded by a fifth trainee concern which stems from the training instructor's attitude. Several trainees, it was reported, were experiencing instructor as well as student hostility in the training classes.

Discussion revealed that the instructor's role is as individual as is the trainee's. Each instructor brings to the Institute his own attitudes, his own biases. For example, one instructor refused at the very last minute to participate in any way in the Institute, expressing the feeling that the Institute was exploiting the poor, especially the Black poor. She would have none of it. Another instructor tolerates trainees but will not otherwise participate in the Institute.

Still another instructor, Mr. Guzman (Mrs. Hanley's training instructor), is reluctant to use the trainees as "instructional assistants" at least at the beginning. That role gets in the way of his fragile, viable relationships with his own students. He needs to protect that relationship. His first commitment is to his students. For too many years they have been considered "less than" by middle-class schools and teachers. His job is to build self-image into a positive, growing thing. The trainee cannot interfere with this relationship; he must take his chances as a "student." Dr. Floyd interpreted the dialog between Mr. Guzman and Mrs. Hanley to mean that part of the retraining process is for the trainee to live the role, not just play the role, of the student who has been made to feel "less than."

Some instructors have accepted the trainees as "instructional assistants," and have so introduced them to their classes. Trainees in these classes have tended to find their class experiences less traumatic, for the time being at least. Sooner or later basic encounter is essential if "retraining" is to result from the experience. Confrontation to a degree is inevitable when as an instructional assistant the trainee finds himself performing as a "practice teacher" either while working with a small group or presenting a "lesson" to the total group. If he has not already validated himself either as a student or as a warm human being he soon finds any narrow expertise he may have is no shield. Nonprofessionals are not about to serve as a captive audience.

Discussion further revealed that regardless of instructor attitude or approach, the trainee's role in the training class is that of a student to this degree: the nonprofessionals in the class are the teachers and the professionals are the learners. Urban community development instructors at Pasadena City College accept this for themselves as well as for other professionals who find themselves in their classes. This is basically why Urban Community Development work-study classes are being used as retraining media. (Is this perhaps why the ethnic oriented classes which are attracting fewer and fewer nonprofessionals are not as satisfactory as retraining media? The sub-committee did not go into this question in depth.)

A sixth trainee concern was identified by Mr. Smith when he observed that role definition is further blurred by lack of institutional commitment. He indicated that something could and would be done about this at his institution.

Discussion brought out that institutional commitment is reflected in various ways: e.g., in method of team selection by each college (Who should be selected? Who should not be selected?); in the college's willingness to effect some necessary released time or rearrangement of schedules for team members, also the college's willingness to receive feedback reports from the team and to make appropriate institutional changes.

Dr. Floyd announced that the January faculty meeting at Pasadena City College will be devoted to a report by the U.E.I. team. He suggested that follow-up analyses could also be made in separate departmental meetings.

U.E.I. Sub-Committee, December 1, 1970 #4

RECOMMENDATIONS; SUMMARY

1. The sub-committee approved the rescheduling of the seminars for the first semester to include one team meeting and seven general group meetings. For the record the general group meetings (Saturday, 9:30 - 12:30 p.m.) are as follows:

October 3	-	UCLA Downtown Extension Building
November 14	-	" " " "
December 5	-	" " " "
December 12	-	East Los Angeles College: Room 108, E8 Building (Mrs. Hanley agreed to distribute maps 12/5)
January 9	-	Pasadena City College: Community Adult Training Center, 1450 N. Lake Avenue, Pasadena
January 23	-	Los Angeles City College, Room 207, Administration Building (Parking: student lot, New Hampshire between Melrose and Monroe)
January 30	-	Compton College, Faculty Lounge (maps to be distributed later)

2. The last four group meetings, which are being held seriatim on the various campuses, will serve to acquaint trainees with each college's programs and facilities for low-income students (one of "felt" needs identified by trainees).

3. This semester's training instructors will be held to only three seminar sessions as per their informal contract with the Institute. They are encouraged, however, to attend as many additional sessions as possible. The sub-committee expressed the view that instructor involvement in the seminar is essential.

4. The project director was invited to attend as many of the general seminar sessions as possible.

5. Each college should evolve its own method of formative evaluation of the Institute, designing its own "feedback" mechanisms, e.g., faculty meetings, departmental meetings, reports to the Administrative Council, etc.

6. Recruitment for second semester teams should get under way immediately. Each College should initiate its own recruiting procedures without waiting for a printed brochure. It was suggested that a January faculty meeting devoted to the Institute could serve as a very effective recruiting device.

7. The sub-committee reiterated Institute goals relative to team membership: a counselor and an administrator to be included on the team. Teams for spring semester are as follows:

Compton College	6	(4, fall semester)
East Los Angeles College	7	(3, " ")
Los Angeles City College	5	(5, " ")
Pasadena City College	6	(4, " ")
	24	16 (total funded = 40)

8. Present trainees may apply for the spring semester. The sub-committee recommended that Colleges be very selective in making final decisions; it was pointed out that not all trainees or their colleges would profit by a second semester's assignment.

9. Retraining media for spring semester should include classes at other community colleges, as recommended in previous meetings of the sub-committee.

Pasadena City College is not scheduling field practice with ethnic oriented classes spring semester. At first most of the students in the new ethnic oriented sociology/psychology classes were nonprofessionals; this semester only a very few are nonprofessionals. Six, possibly seven, urban community development work-study classes will be available as retraining media (see attached list). These classes will provide training slots for twelve trainees. Twelve more slots are needed.

Los Angeles City College has indicated that two types of classes might be used: 1) classes in education for COP and other instructional aides in the Los Angeles Unified School District, and 2) special psychology classes developed to implement the O.E. funded project in special services for the disadvantaged.

East Los Angeles College made the original recommendation that other colleges provide retraining media. Since that time Claude Parker, New Careers coordinator, has been reassigned to Pierce College. Mr. Smith will explore the possibility of East Los Angeles classes being utilized.

Dr. Macfarlane will follow with Compton College.

10. A meeting of the seminar should be scheduled very early in the spring semester to provide minimum "orientation" for trainees and for instructors of spring semester training classes.

(Might not part of the January 30th meeting be so utilized? Present trainees could assist in orientation as part of their final evaluation of their experiences in the Institute.)

11. The sub-committee reaffirmed that in the final analysis it is institutional commitment that will determine whether or not the Institute is an effective device for retraining experienced community college personnel.

ADJOURNMENT: UNFINISHED BUSINESS

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m., to reconvene at the call of the chair. The following items of Unfinished Business need early attention: 1) Tutors and their roles; 2) Brochure for spring semester; 3) Administration of a bifurcated program spring semester, i.e., implementation on more than one campus.

Respectfully submitted,

Ruth Macfarlane

Ruth Macfarlane (with the able assistance of Jack Smith, Secretary pro tem)

December 4, 1970

Addendum: On December 5, Dr. John Grande, after reviewing rough notes of these minutes, made the following suggestions and comments:

1. The trainees appear to express common concerns. Should they not therefore be treated as a group and receive their training as a group (rather than in "retraining classes")?

2. Could the information and experiences available in the individual classes at PCC not be presented to the whole group of trainees during the Saturday meetings?

3. The Saturday meetings (if the above is a viable suggestion) should be held every week.

4. All the valuable experiences of the classroom should probably be centered on the activities of the seminar sessions on Saturday.

PASADENA CITY COLLEGE
1570 EAST COLORADO BOULEVARD
PASADENA, CALIFORNIA 91106

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA COLLEGE CONSORTIUM

June 16, 1970

Present:

Compton College
Abel Sykes, President
Jack Tatum, Social Science Department

East Los Angeles College
Jack Smith, Dean of Instruction

Los Angeles City College
Mrs. Hope Holcomb, Dean of Development

Pasadena City College
Dr. Armen Sarafian, President/Superintendent
Dr. E. Howard Floyd, Vice President

University of California Los Angeles
Dr. Charles Z. Wilson, Vice Chancellor for Academic Programs
Dr. Elwin Svenson, Assistant Chancellor
Dr. Simon Gonzalez, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Programs

Also Present:

Donald H. Brunet, Director of Governmental Affairs/Programs, Division of Instruction, Los Angeles Community Colleges
Dr. Robert Kindred, UCLA Extension
Dr. Ruth Macfarlane, Director, Urban Education Institute
Henry Guzman, Coordinator/Instructor, Urban Community Development, Pasadena City College

Call to Order The luncheon meeting of the Consortium was called to order at 1 p.m., in the Faculty Dining Room, Pasadena City College, by the Chairman Pro Tem, Dr. Charles Z. Wilson, UCLA.

Purpose of Meeting The purpose of the meeting was to assess the achievements of the Consortium over the past two years with the objective of determining the scope and extent of future Consortium activities.

Dr. Wilson referred to the Urban Education Institute as one specific accomplishment of the Consortium, observing that the Institute was an example of how people of good will can get together to pool their resources to accomplish a common goal.

Urban Education Institute At Dr. Wilson's request, Dr. Macfarlane reviewed the history of the Institute and described its present status. (Refer to minutes of meeting, April 28, 1970, of Consortium's Sub-Committee on the Urban Education Institute.)

UCLA and the Consortium Dr. Wilson reaffirmed the University's interest in the Consortium, whose goals and objectives, he pointed out, are consonant with those of UCLA in its efforts to bring about closer town and gown collaboration. Dr. Wilson then proceeded to pinpoint the effect on the Consortium of administrative reorganization. His office, Academic Programs, is concerned with academic change. An assistant will seek academic innovation through the development of adjunct and part-time degree programs which, it is hoped, will begin to meet upper division work-study (cooperative education) needs of New Careerists.

Another assistant will pull together into one office academic services for students, including admissions and financial aids. University Extension will be part of Academic Programs. Dr. Simon Gonzalez, as of September 1, 1970, will begin to serve as Assistant Vice Chancellor for Minority Education Programs. Dr. Wilson is asking Dr. Gonzalez to assume responsibility for the Consortium. Dr. Wilson indicated that he and Dr. Svenson would carry of for the Consortium between now and September 1st. Dr. Gonzalez expressed pleasure at his Consortium assignment. He looks forward to working with individual colleges.

In closing his remards Dr. Wilson urged that the Consortium think about electing a permanent chairman.

Report on Related Activities At Dr. Svenson's suggestion, Consortium members reported on a variety of related funded activities. These included:

1 UCLA: small Model Cities project involving city of Compton, - and Compton City College.

2 UCLA, East Los Angeles and Los Angeles City Colleges: special services project (federal) to encourage University to give more attention to upper level students.

3 Compton and Los Angeles City Colleges: special services projects (federal) to supplement SB 164 (state).

4 Compton: project under HEA Title III, Developing Institutions; could be model for Consortium.

5 Compton, East Los Angeles, Los Angeles City and Pasadena City Colleges: SB 164 projects (state).

6 UCLA: OE/BEPD's 1970 priority, Career Opportunities Program, has appointed Dr. Gonzalez as a working member of its Leadership Training Institute. He has been with Institute since June 1969.

Minutes, Meeting of Consortium, 6/16/70, #3

7 Los Angeles Community Colleges are providing career education for educational assistants employed by the Los Angeles Unified School District, - linkage with serveral funded programs with LAUSD as prime contractor.

New Educational Needs Discussion isolated following needs which should be considered by Consortium in planning future activities:

1 Need for more innovative supportive services by community colleges in order to be more effective in retention of students recruited through special financial aids programs.

2 Need for University to explore, and implement through appropriate action by the Academic Senate and the Regents, - potential of part-time degrees, with concurrent development of curricula around student's ongoing employment, - i.e., New Careers at the university level.

3 Need to crank the University's Research and Development Center into Consortium and related projects.

EPDA/E FY 1971 Dr. Svenson pointed out that August 1, 1970 is the deadline date for 1971 proposals under EPDA/E, which funds the Urban Education Institute. He also reported that the Washington bureau responsible for administering Part E Bureau of Higher Education, (Office of College Support, - Dr. Paul H. Carnell, Director) will be willing to criticize a prospectus.

It was decided that two proposals should be submitted, one to be a renewal of the Urban Education Institute to show continuing interest in the project on the part of the prime contractor and the Consortium. The second proposal should be a new one to be developed by the Consortium around the "needs" specified above.

A sub-committee was appointed to write the new porposal: Hope Holcomb, Herbert Kaplan, Robert Kindred, Ruth Macfarlane, Claude Parker, and Jack Tatum. A planning meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, July 7, at Los Angeles City College. Mrs. Holcomb will send out notices. The resulting propectus will then be discussed with Dr. Carnell's office through a telephone conference to be set up by Dr. Svenson.

Permanent Chairman No action was taken regarding permanent chairman.

Adjournment The meeting adjourned at 2 p.m., to reconvene at the call of the Chairman Pro Tempore.

Respectfully submitted,

Ruth Macfarlane

Ruth Macfarlane
Secretary Pro Tempore
July 20, 1970

PASADENA CITY COLLEGE
1570 EAST COLORADO BOULEVARD
PASADENA, CALIFORNIA 91106

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA COLLEGE CONSORTIUM

Sub-Committee on Urban Education Institute

April 28, 1970

Present:

Compton College
Jack Tatum, Instructor, Social Science Department
East Los Angeles College
Claude Parker, Project Coordinator, New Careers
Robert Sayette, Coordinator, Vocational Education
Los Angeles City College
Hope Holcomb, Dean of Development
Pasadena City College
Dr. Armen Sarafian, Superintendent/President
Dr. Ruth Macfarlane, Urban Community Development Specialist
University of California, Los Angeles
Dr. Elwin Svenson, Coordinator, Overseas Program
Dr. Robert B. Kindred, University Extension, Education
Dr. Richard Seligman, Research and Development, School of Education

The meeting was called to order at 10:30 a.m., in Room 2121, Murphy Hall, UCLA. Dr. Svenson served as Chairman.

Minutes. Minutes of the last meeting, April 8, were distributed. They were accepted with two corrections: 1) Sub-committee's name corrected; should read "Sub-committee on Urban Education Institute;" 2) attachment: Socio 130 should read "Introduction to Social Work Assisting."

Final Plan of Operation: Copies of a budget worksheet were distributed. The worksheet incorporated suggestions made at the meeting on April 8, also by the program officer in Washington where Dr. Macfarlane conferred with him on April 14.

It was the sense of the meeting that the budget to be submitted to Washington should support a final plan of operation that includes the following basic concepts:

1 Self-correcting evaluative procedures should be built into the project through a postgraduate professional seminar.

2 The seminar should be the integrative force to tie together participants' many varied classroom and community experiences.

3 The seminar should be a wide ranging activity, taking the university professor/consultant into training classrooms at PCC and into the community with participants.

4 The seminar should be mandatory for all participants.

5 The seminar should be a credit activity, probably three semester units. No fees shall be charged participants.

Other points of agreement included:

Retraining media for the first semester at least will be limited to Pasadena City College's ongoing urban community development classes; classes for New Careerists at other colleges may be utilized during the second semester.

The Consortium Sub-committee on the Urban Education Institute should be expanded into a broader based advisory committee, to include a representative from the Los Angeles New Careers Organization (preferably Jose Edwards, Director), and a representative from one or more civil service commissions, e.g., Herb Kaplan, Los Angeles County Personnel Board. Participants and ghetto/barrio tutors should be appointed to the advisory committee in September. The advisory committee should plan to meet four times during 1970-71. A meeting may need to be held in July to advise on a proposal for 1971-72 (deadline July 31st last year).

The Sub-committee on the Urban Education Institute should continue to report periodically to the Consortium. It was specifically recommended that a meeting of the Consortium be held the first week in June to receive such a report. Presidents of participating community colleges should be urged to attend that meeting.

Participants. It was reiterated that each college was responsible for recruiting its own team of 4-5 participants, and for making arrangements for such released time or program rescheduling as may be necessary. Each participant will be committed to a significant block of time each week, - three hours in a classroom situation as "instructional assistant," and several additional hours in the community with one or more ghetto/barrio tutors.

There was some discussion about a participant's specific duties and responsibilities as "instructional assistant," and the need, if any, for a kind of job description. Dr. Macfarlane indicated that it would be a very individual affair,

depending on the background, interest and imagination of the participant and the particular class and instructor involved. A statement probably should be prepared, however, suggesting to the coordinator/instructor how best to ucilize and train the "instructional assistant." The Sub-committee should assist in preparation of such a statement.

UCLA Involvement. This project has caused the Research and Development Center to reconsider its policy of sub-contracts. The Center discourages involvement in field service activities as called for by the project. Dr. Seligman suggested that any project arrangements for evaluation should be made directly with a staff member rather than with the Center itself.

Following discussion of seminar/evaluation integration, the final decision was to the effect that Pasadena City College should contract with the Extension Division for needed University services. Dr. Kindred suggested that such a contract should be in the form of a "letter agreement."

Next Steps. Dr. Macfarlane is to telephone the project's program officer in Washington relative to earmarking a total of $9,250 for a UCLA seminar which will incorporate a self-correcting evaluation design and will cover fees for three semester units of credit for all participants. The final plan of operation, together with supporting budget, will then need to be cleared with the contract officer in Washington. As soon as approval is received a brochure should be distributed, and seminar details worked out with UCLA Extension.

Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 12 noon, to reconvene at the call of the Chairman, pro tem.

Respectfully submitted,

Ruth Macfarlane

Ruth Macfarlane, Secretary pro tem

Enclosed: Final Plan of Operation, with supporting budget, submitted to Washington 5/12/70.

5/14/70.

PASADENA CITY COLLEGE
1570 EAST COLORADO BOULEVARD
PASADENA, CALIFORNIA 91106

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA COLLEGE CONSORTIUM

Sub-Committee on Urban Institute

April 8, 1970

Present:

East Los Angeles College
- Jack Smith, Dean of Instruction, Chairman
  Experimental Curriculum Subcommittee
- Claude Parker, Project Coordinator, New Careers
- Jared Sharon, Coordinator, Specially Funded Projects
- Robert Sayette, Coordinator, Vocational Education

Los Angeles City College
- Dr. Hope Holcomb, Dean of Development

Pasadena City College
- Dr. Ruth Macfarlane, Urban Community Development Specialist

University of California, Los Angeles
- Dr. Charles Z. Wilson, Vice Chancellor
- Dr. Elwin Svenson, Coordinator, Overseas Program
- Dr. Robert B. Kindred, University Extension (Education)
- Dr. Richard Seligman, Education-Research and Development

Absent:

Compton College
- Jack Tatum, Instructor, Social Science Department

- - - -

The meeting was convened at 10:30 a.m., in Room 2121, Murphy Hall, UCLA. Dr. Svenson, chairman pro tem, indicated that the major item on the agenda was consideration of the Urban Institute proposal approved under Title E, Education Professions Development Act, P.L. 9-035. He commented that this proposal represented one of the Consortium's concrete efforts possible of implementation.

BACKGROUND

At Dr. Svenson's suggestion Miss Macfarlane summarized the proposal's chronology, as follows:

June 1969: Miss Macfarlane had conference in Washington with officer responsible for administration of EPDA/E, i.e., Dr. Paul Carnell, Assistant Director, Division of College Support, OE/Bureau of Higher Education. He pinpointed priorities which would be contained in forthcoming guidelines: community college experienced personnel to be retrained to work with low-income minority students; community involvement with real not simulated basic encounters with indigenous community leaders; consortium.

July 1969: Miss Macfarlane had the opportunity to visit San Francisco City College, to discuss ongoing EPDA/E summer institute; picked up idea for ghetto tutors to assist in retraining process.

Guidelines received about July 15, with two-week deadline. Telephone conferences with as many Consortium members as possible.

7/31: Pasadena City College mailed two proposals (Urban Institute for summer 1970, and Urban Institute for academic year 1970-71), built around participation of Consortium. Copies of proposals, with covering letter signed by Dr. Armen Sarafian, sent to Consortium members.

August 5, 1969: Meeting of Consortium; Urban Institute proposals included among those to be discussed by Dr. Wilson in forthcoming trip to Washington.

September 1969: Miss Macfarlane held individual conferences with presidents of community college members of Consortium; each expressed interest in participating in Urban Institute.

October 1-3, 1969: Miss Macfarlane participated with Dr. Carnell in AAJC/Federal Affairs Workshop, Washington, D. C.; he volunteered no information on fate of EPDA/E proposals.

October 24, 1969: Meeting of Consortium; no official action taken on Urban Institute proposals.

February 2, 1970: Miss Macfarlane had telephone conference with Dr. Carnell on another matter; was informed that proposal was in first run of projects if and when President signed appropriation bill.

March 1, 1970: Notice of award for $57,000 (as against $63,768 in application), Urban Institute for Academic Year 1970-71.

March 13, 1970: Letters from Dr. Sarafian to Consortium members, notifying them of award and suggesting activation of advisory committee.

March 26, 1970: Telephone message received from Dr. Wilson's office to effect that Dr. Svenson would represent the University on Urban Institute Committee.

DISCUSSION

1 Number of Participants

The first question concerned balancing the budget by reducing the number of participants, from forty to, say, 30 or 34.

Pasadena City College: The number of participants could be easily reduced since the number of retraining media, i.e., number of urban community development core classes, will be fewer than anticipated in the proposal, which was based on ten, allowing for twenty participants each semester. The tentative schedule for fall semester shows only six such core classes, with one possible additional depending on whether or not the Title VIII proposal is approved. (See Attachment #1 for list of scheduled core classes) To compensate, however, it would be possible to use other ethnic oriented classes.

East Los Angeles College: Strongly recommended no reduction in number of participants. East LA could absorb several trainees in the Learning Center, which enrolls a number of New Careerists, in special sociology classes developed for New Careerists, and in community development classes at Civic Center under Title VIII funding.

Los Angeles City College: Could also pick up participants, - in New Careers classes developed for teacher aides employed in Los Angeles city schools; in connection with the Mobile Advisory Units, as well as in connection with SB 164 programs.

2 Evaluation; Postgraduate Seminars

Dr. Svenson pointed out that UCLA is committed to evaluation. He also emphasized the importance of evaluation even though federal programs tend to discourage expenditure of funds for evaluation and/or research.

There was some discussion (Dr. Kindred, Dr. Seligman) about the postgraduate extension course being used as a medium for evaluation, with the instructor serving as the chief evaluator. Dr. Svenson noted that such an arrangement would net $9,750 for evaluation ($7,500 for evaluation per se, $2,250 for "fees" for participants in a UCLA seminar to be designed).

Discussion then centered on the nature of the proposed seminars. It was urged (Mr. Smith) that they be held concurrently with urban community development work-study classes, and that they be utilized as evaluative sessions not only for the Urban Institute but for related activities, e.g., ethnic oriented curricula. Dr. Svenson recommended that Mr. Smith follow on this suggestion and make more specific recommendations at a later meeting of the committee.

It was the consensus that Dr. Seligman should follow with Research and Development, UCLA School of Education, about coordination with Urban Institute evaluation activities.

Dr. Svenson urged that the Committee not be boxed in by the amount of the award. The total budget might turn out to be $157,000 and more. The committee should dream big even though it may have to settle for only what it can do well within the time limit. Dr. Macfarlane indicated that she would be in Washington the following week and would be checking in with the desk officer assigned the project. His deadlines may dictate quicker action.

3 Honoraria, Instructional Assistants

The proposal calls for an honorarium of $600 for each participant in lieu of stipends which are not allowable in connection with part-time, long-term institutes. The award would indicate that this budget item has been approved.

It was suggested that it would be possible to reduce the budget from $63,768 to $57,000 in part by decreasing the honorarium to $550, even to $450. It was pointed out, however, that nothing should be done to discourage participants from putting in the full amount of time expected of them, approximately nine hours per week (3 hours in the theory class, six hours in the community with barrio/ghetto tutors). Community activities are as important as class activities in the retraining process.

4 Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12 noon, to reconvene on April 28, 10-12 noon, at the call of the Chairman pro tem.

New business should include committee membership and organization; also preparation and distribution of brochure.

Respectfully submitted,

Ruth Macfarlane

Ruth Macfarlane, Secretary pro tem

April 27, 1970.

PASADENA CITY COLLEGE
1570 EAST COLORADO BOULEVARD
PASADENA, CALIFORNIA 91106

URBAN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

WORK-STUDY CLASSES

Fall Semester 1970

Socio 227/Socio 130	Introduction to Educational Assisting Tuesday	2:30-5:30 p.m.	7 units * New
Socio 227/Pol Sc 131	Urban Political Problems Tuesday	7:00-10:00 p.m.	7 units * Mr. Henry Guzman
Socio 227/Socio 125	Community Agencies Wednesday	2:30-5:30 p.m.	7 units * New
Socio 227/Ed 130	Introduction to Educational Assisting Wednesday	2:30-5:30 p.m.	7 units * Mr. Henry Guzman
Socio 227/Socio 127	Professional/Nonprofessional Roles Thursday	2:30-5:30 p.m.	7 units * Mrs. Faye Munoz
Socio 227/Socio 29	Sociology of the Afro-American Thursday	2:30-5:30 p.m.	7 units * Mrs. Jeffalyn Johnson

If Title VIII Project approved:

Socio 227/Pol Sc 130	Introduction to Government Assisting Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday	2:30-5:30 p.m.	7 units * New

* 4 units for Socio 227; 3 units for theory

4-8-70

Southern California College Consortium
Sub-Committee on New Careers

First Meeting: March 24, 1969
10-12 Room 113C
Pasadena City College.

Present: Ruth Macfarlane, Chairman (Pasadena City College)
Claude Parker (East Los Angeles College)
Elwin Svenson (University of California, Los Angeles)
Abel Sykes (Compton College)

Absent: Robert Holcomb (Los Angeles City College)

The purposes of the sub-committee were reexamined.

1 to keep the Consortium informed about significant developments in New Careers (see Bibliography/Directory distributed 12/68; also see revised Bibliography, 3/69) attached);

2 to suggest possible action, if any, to be taken by the Consortium in the direction of New Careers, looking to funding proposals for FY 1970.

Developments in New Careers: The sub-committee noted current trends in New Careers, with special reference to preliminary EPDA Guidelines for the Career Opportunities Program, FY 1970, and emphasis on New Careers in AAJC's expanded program for the disadvantaged (Junior College Journal, March 1969).

Report to Consortium

1 Insofar as FY 1970-71-72 proposals are concerned, the switch is on to New Careers.

2 The three basics of New Careers (See Bibliography 3/69) afford unique opportunities to higher education, particularly the community college segment. At the same time, however, these opportunities bring problems which high echelon administrators must face if realistic FY 1970-72 proposals are to be written and funded.

3 The sub-committee, therefore, recommends an Institute of high echelon administrators of Consortium colleges be held within the next five to six weeks, to explore

a The unique opportunities afforded by New Careers as a result of 1968 and proposed 1969 amendments to antipoverty, compensatory education, vocational education and social security legislation.

b The resultant problems facing higher education, particularly community colleges, -

1) dramatic curricular changes because of the JET approach; Job first, Education and Training later;

2) financial implications of JET, i.e., credit for community experience, raising the question of the cost of releasing adequate teacher time for coordination of field experience (need to revise California Administrative Code Section 115.23, and California Education Code Section 11251);

3) articulation of emerging preprofessional curricula in the human services and other areas of New Careers employment;

4) need for more effective evaluative techniques of on-going and proposed New Careers projects.

c More effective ways to tie Consortium activities into on-going and future related activities, e.g., UCLA's Teacher Corps proposal, Pasadena City College's EPDA Institute for Bilingual Teacher Aides, other EPDA projects in the Los Angeles area; FY 1970 programs with particular emphasis on the new thrust, veterans.

Details of Proposed Institute

1 A target date of April 30 was suggested in view of the possibility of securing Don Davies (Associate Commissioner, U. S. Office of Education, Bureau of Educational Personnel Development) as a resource person. Mr. Davies is to be in California May 1 and 2 in connection with a workshop to be held in Burlingame on instructional aides. The Chair was commissioned to clear with Mr.Davies.

(Addendum: Mr. Davies is available May 2).

2 Membership of the institute should consist of four members from each of the Consortium's constitutent colleges.

The sub-committee emphasizes that the proposed Institute is aimed at top echelon administrators since only they can cope with the institutional problems involved in implementing New Careers. Specifically, the president and dean of instruction from each of the four community colleges should participate in the Institute, plus two other representatives from each community college, to be selected by the President.

UCLA representation should include the Director of University Extension.

3 East Los Angeles College graciously offered to host the meeting. It is recommended that the Institute begin about 3:30 p.m. and continue through an early dinner meeting. In this way it is hoped that busy administrators would be encouraged to attend. In addition, rush hour traffic would be avoided. (Addendum: A Friday, rather than a Wednesday meeting may change this arrangement, calling, instead, for an extended luncheon meeting, say 11:30 a.m.-3:30 p.m.).

Respectfully submitted,

Ruth Macfarlane

Ruth Macfarlane, Secretary pro tempore

March 27, 1969

3/27/69: Copy given to Dr. Charles Wilson, UCLA, for appropriate action.

TOTAL

APPENDIX V, P. 1

URBAN EDUCATION INSTITUTE

Trainee Evaluation
Spring Semester 1971

TO: _____ _____
Trainee College

In addition to the USOE Participant form which you have already completed you can help the staff to evaluate the Urban Education Institute by filling out this questionnaire. Thank you very much.

Ruth Macfarlane
Ruth Macfarlane, Director

I TRAINING MEDIUM

1 What type of training medium were you assigned to this semester:

- [11] New Careers class (title: _____)
- [6] ethnic studies class (title: _____)
- [2] study skills center (__1__ SB164, __1__ Other _____)
- [1] mobile counseling center (location: _____)
- [4] other (please describe: _____)

2 Please indicate time you were involved in training medium:

Hours per week [3] Number of weeks [17] Total hrs for semester [50]

3 Describe your role as "instructional assistant:" _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

(over, please)

4 Describe students enrolled in your training medium:

[10] mostly low-income adults (New Careerists)

[13] mostly low-income minority students (younger adults)

[0] mostly middle-class

5 In terms of your relationship with regular participants of training medium

a were you able to develop good rapport? Yes [24] No [1]

b were you singled out for "special treatment?" Yes [2] No [23]

If yes, please describe: _____

_____

_____

6 In terms of its content/purpose, describe training medium:

[12] introduced many new concepts, ideas, information

[11] included some new material, some familiar material

[1] nothing new; dealt with familiar material

7 How would you describe the attitude of the instructor/supervisor toward you?

[19] extremely supportive; involved you in activities

[5] moderately supportive; occasionally took time to confer

[0] neutral; rarely took time to confer

[0] negative; never conferred or discussed Institute

[0] hostile; seemed to resent your presence in class

8 Would you recommend your particular training medium be utilized next year:

Yes [22] No [2]

Why? _____

_____

_____

_____

(please continue)

UEI, Trainee Evaluation, 6/71, #3

APPENDIX V, p. 2

II TUTOR RELATIONSHIPS

9 Please estimate amount of time spent with your tutor in the community:

[8] 24 hours or more [5] 15-24 hours [9] 10-15 hours

[1] 5-10 hours [1] 5 hours or less

10 Describe community activities with tutor: _____

_____

_____

_____

11 Did your tutor show up for all scheduled appointments? [Yes 21] [No 3]

12 Did you have any difficulties in working with tutor? [Yes 0] [No 24]

If yes, please describe: _____

_____

_____

13 Do you expect to continue relationship with tutor after Institute ends? [Yes 20] [No 4]

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

14 Did you have any difficulty in selecting a tutor? [Yes 3] [No 21]

If yes, please indicate problems: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

(over, please)

15 Should trainees be required to work with a tutor? [Yes 19] [No 3]

Why? _____

16 How should tutors be selected?

[4] by trainee

[19] by trainee with assistance of training instructor

[1] by training instructor

[0] by Institute staff

17 Did tutor-trainee activities/relationships make a significant contribution to your total Institute experience? [Yes 22] [No 2]

Comments: _____

18 To what extent did tutor-trainee relationships expand your community awareness?

Considerable [18] A little [5] Very little [1]

Comments: _____

19 Describe relationship between tutor-trainee community experiences and activities of training medium: _____

(please continue)

UCLA, Trainee Evaluation, 6/71, #5

[APPENDIX V, p. 3]

[III UCLA SEMINAR]

20 How would you describe the seminar?

1) [10] stimulating; relevant 2) [8] relevant, not too exciting

3) [6] just so-so 4) [0] a drag 5) [0] a waste of time

21 Was University credit for seminar important to you? [Yes 12] [No 12]

If yes, why? _____

_____

_____

22 Which were the more valuable? [16] group sessions [6] team meetings

Why? _____

_____

_____

23 Is tutor involvement in seminar important? [Yes 20] [No 4]

Why? _____

_____

_____

24 Is training instructor involvement important? [Yes 22] [No 1]

Why? _____

_____

_____

25 Suggestions for improving seminar next year: _____

_____

_____

_____

(over, please)

IV GENERAL QUESTIONS

26 Was your orientation to Institute sufficient? [Yes 15] [No 0]

If not, what information was lacking? _____

_____

_____

27 What can your college do

a to improve procedures for selecting and orienting trainees? _____

_____

_____

b to profit from your involvement in Institute? _____

_____

_____

28 How do you anticipate your performance on the job will change as a result of your participation in the Institute?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

29 How would you evaluate the Institute and your participation in it?

[10] extremely valuable, providing what was expected and needed

[9] moderately valuable, providing some of what was expected and needed

[1] of limited value, providing few expected or needed experiences

____ of no value

30 Would you recommend the Institute to your colleagues? [Yes 21] [No 3]

THE END THANK YOU

APPENDIX V, p. 4

TOTAL

URBAN EDUCATION INSTITUTE

Training Instructor's Evaluation of Trainee
Spring Semester 1971

TO: _____ RE: _____
Training Instructor Trainee

GOALS of Urban Education Institute: The Institute is designed to train experienced community college personnel to work more effectively, and affectively, with increasing numbers of low-income minority students. Three types of training activities provide involvement in black/brown experiences: trainee serves as an instructional assistant in a selected training medium; trainee expands his community awareness with the aid of a ghetto/barrio tutor; trainee participates in a UCLA seminar in community involvement skills.

As training instructor you will help us to evaluate the Institute if you will answer the following questions about the trainee named above. Please return directly to me in envelope provided.

Ruth Macfarlane

Ruth Macfarlane, Director

1 Attendance: Average Number of sessions trainee was present 15

Average Number of sessions trainee was absent 3

Was trainee attendance acceptable in terms of the policies which you have for regularly enrolled students? Yes 20 No 0

2 Describe trainee's role, and activities, as "instructional assistant:"

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

(over, please)

3 Involvement of trainee in activities of training medium:

a Did he take an active role? Yes [23] No [0]

b Did he develop good rapport with other students during scheduled activities? Yes [23] No [0]

c Did he socialize with students during coffee breaks, other informal activities? Yes [23] No [0]

4 Please evaluate efficacy of your class activity as training medium in terms of goals of the Institute:

5 Did trainee have difficulty selecting a tutor? Yes [2] No [21]

6 Did you assist trainee in selecting a tutor? Yes [13] No [9]

If yes, please indicate what you did?

7 Should the training instructor select tutor for trainee? Yes [9] No [13]

Why?

(please continue)

UEI, Training Instructor Questionnaire, 6/71, #3

8 To what extent should training instructor guide or suggest community activities of trainee with tutor?

[5] a great deal, with close-follow-up by instructor

[16] casually, with informal reports from trainee and tutor

[1] not at all

9 Please comment about validity of community experiences through use of tutor:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

10 To what extent was UCLA seminar of value to trainee?

[2] extremely valuable

[11] moderately valuable

[1] minimally valuable

11 To what extent was UCLA seminar of value to you as training instructor?

[7] extremely valuable

[13] moderately valuable

[1] minimally valuable

12 Do you think training instructors should be required to participate in the UCLA seminar? Yes [19] No [3]

Why? _____

_____

_____

_____

(over, please)

13 Please comment about requirement that trainees be enrolled in UCLA seminar in community involvement skills:

14 Please indicate extent of trainee's progress toward Institute's goals:

[10] outstanding	[0] less than average
[7] considerable	[0] minimal
[1] average	[4] unable to determine

15 Was your participation in the Urban Education Institute worthwhile? Yes [22] No [0]

16 Would you be interested in participating next year? Yes [19] No [5]

17 Comments and suggestions about the Urban Education Institute:

THE END - THANK YOU

APPENDIX V, p. 3

TOTAL

URBAN EDUCATION INSTITUTE

Tutor Evaluation
Spring Semester 1971

TO: _____ RE: _____
Tutor Trainee

GOALS of Urban Education Institute: The Institute is designed to train experienced community college personnel to work more effectively, and affectively, with increasing numbers of low-income minority students. Three types of training activities provide involvement in black/brown experiences: trainee serves as an instructional assistant in a selected training medium; trainee expands his community awareness with the aid of a ghetto/barrio tutor; trainee participates in a UCLA seminar in community involvement skills.

Your input as a tutor will help us immeasurably in our efforts to evaluate the Institute. Your cooperation in filling out this questionnaire will be appreciated. Thank you very much.

Ruth Macfarlane
Ruth Macfarlane, Director

1 Please estimate amount of time you spent with trainee in the community:

[8] 24 hours or more [5] 15-24 hours [9] 10-15 hours

[0] 5-10 hours [0] 5 hours or less

2 Did your trainee show up for all scheduled appointments? Yes [22] No [0]

3 Describe the things which you did in the community with your trainee, e.g., places visited, discussions, etc.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

(over, please)

4 Were you selected as a tutor by your trainee? Yes 19 No 3

If no, describe how you were selected: _____

5 Did you have any difficulties in working with trainee? Yes 0 No 22

If yes, please describe: _____

6 Do you expect to continue your relationship with your trainee after the Institute ends? Yes 20 No 2

Comments: _____

7 Did your tutoring activities result in any problems with the agency in which you are regularly employed? Yes 1 No 21

8 What was agency reaction to your assignment as tutor: _____

(please continue)

9 To what extent did your community activities with trainee relate to his experiences in training medium (New Careers class, study skills center, etc.):

10 Should tutor be identified with the training medium, e.g., as a student in the class serving as training medium? Yes [14] No [4]

Why?

11 To what extent do you think your trainee made progress toward achievement of goals of the Institute? (see p. 1 of this questionnaire)

- [13] outstanding
- [2] considerable
- [4] average
- [0] less than average
- [0] minimal
- [1] unable to determine

12 Are tutors important to the success of the Institute? Yes [22] No [0]

Why?

13 How should tutors be selected next year?

- [17] by trainee
- [8] by training instructor
- [2] by Institute staff

(over, please)

14 Was the UCLA seminar a valuable experience for you?

[0] extremely valuable

[11] moderately valuable

[1] little value

15 Comments, suggestions for greater involvement of tutors in UCLA seminar:

16 Was your participation in the Institute worthwhile? Yes [21] No [0]

Comments:

17 If selected, would you be interested in participating as a tutor next year?

Yes [20] No [2]

18 Would you encourage others to participate as tutors? Yes [22] No [0]

THE END THANK YOU